

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Leader and Cabinet 8 May 2008
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Senior Planning Policy Officer

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL ON THE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR A SECOND RUNWAY AT STANSTED AIRPORT

Purpose

- 1 BAA has submitted to Uttlesford District Council a number of planning applications to get a second runway and all the associated facilities at Stansted Airport. This project has been called Stansted Generation 2 or G2 by BAA. This Council as one of the statutory consultees has been asked for its comments on these proposals.
- 2 Comments need to be sent to Uttlesford District Council by 26 June 2008.
- 3 This is a key decision because it is likely to have a significant effect on communities living or working in the District. It was first published in the May Forward Plan.

Executive Summary

- 4 BAA has submitted a planning application to get a second runway and associated facilities at Stansted Airport. This report outlines how these proposals will affect South Cambridgeshire. The Council retains its position set out in March 2006 of not supporting a second runway at Stansted.
- 5 However the Council has assessed the current proposals and without prejudice to that policy position has responded to the relevant matters in the current proposals. It supports the decision of BAA to opt for a segregated mode runway. The Council is concerned at the capacity of the new runway to allow more aircraft to use the airport. The increased capacity of Stansted could have two important implications for South Cambridgeshire – increased noise and increased passenger numbers, which will impact on the infrastructure of the wider community.

Background

- 6 In May 2006 the Cabinet considered a report on a consultation by British Airports Authority (BAA) on Masterplan options for a second runway at Stansted Airport. As a result of this report the Council responded to BAA in the following terms-
 - (1) South Cambridgeshire District Council supports the East of England Regional Assembly position that accepts the expansion of the airport up to the full capacity of its existing single runway (Policy ST5) but it does not support a second runway, which would create serious environmental damage to the surrounding area and contribute to global warming.
 - (2) Without prejudice to that policy position and without prejudice to the Council being able to assess the overall impact of a fully worked up proposal to expand Stansted to a 2 runway airport, South Cambridgeshire District Council is concerned that the British Airports Authority has not provided sufficient information for the Council to assess the impact of additional aircraft movements over South Cambridgeshire, namely:

- It is not possible to give a full opinion on the proposed options contained within the consultation document with regards to potential noise effects on South Cambs residents. The report is not detailed enough to make an adequate assessment.
- In order to make a proper assessment data is needed on predicted noise levels at South Cambs properties both at ground level and air noise. These figures would need to take into account stacking of aircraft which is likely to take place over South Cambs, not just take off and landings.
- Noise contours should be provided for 54 dBA leq and 50 dBA leq in line with WHO recommendations. These noise contours should be mapped for the years preceding 2030 as well as just 2030
- Information on the number of proposed night flights and day flights, including flight paths should also be provided.
- As a general point there is no data on impacts of air pollution, the report should include: CO2 emissions, NO2, NOx, SO2, PM10, PM2.5 these should be referenced to Local Air Quality

(3) However, on the basis of the evidence provided by the British Airports Authority, South Cambridgeshire District Council would have a strong preference for options operating in segregated mode which would have least environmental impact, including upon South Cambridgeshire, and would be more consistent with the Future of Air Transport White Paper requirement for stringent environmental limits than 2 runways operated in mixed mode.

7 Since 2006 the draft Regional Spatial Strategy for East of England (RSS) has been revised and Policy ST5 has been deleted as a result of the comments made by the inspectors of the Examination in Public in their Panel Report. The Panel Report stated that it was not for the RSS to consider the expansion of Stansted Airport since this is Government Policy as contained in the Air Transport White Paper (ATWP) published in December 2003.

8 The ATWP sets out in relation to Stansted the following conclusions

- (a) Making best use of the existing runway at Stansted
- (b) The provision of two new runways in the South East in the 30-year period to 2030
- (c) Development as soon as possible (BAA expects around 2011/12) of a wide-spaced second runway at Stansted, with strict environmental controls, as the first new runway to be built in the South East (the other would be at Heathrow or Gatwick)

9 BAA had progressed one of the objectives from the ATWP by submitting an application to Uttlesford District Council to increase the capacity of the existing runway at Stansted. These proposals are called Stansted 1 or G1 by BAA. Uttlesford rejected this application and a public inquiry was held in 2007 the results of which have not yet been made. For the purposes of this current application BAA are assuming that they will be successful with their appeal.

10 A consultation was carried out by BAA in February 2007 into Stansted Generation 2: Surface Access Strategy. The purpose of this was to seek comments from the public about proposals to develop multi-modal surface access infrastructure and service improvements that would be required to support the provision of a second runway, terminal and associated facilities. The Cabinet considered a report on this strategy and this has been included as **Appendix 1**.
The current proposal - the G2 project

11 The G2 Project by BAA consists of three parts

1. Expansion of the existing Airport by provision of a wide-spaced second runway and associated facilities (the G2 Airport Project)
 2. The provision of new junctions on the M11 and A120 to provide improved access to the expanded Airport (the G2 Junctions Project);
 3. Provision of a second rail tunnel and fourth platform at the Airport to facilitate improved rail access (the G2 Rail Project)
- 12 **G2 Airport Development-** this consists of the construction and operation of a second runway to the east of the existing Airport and associated Airport and commercial development. The two-runway Airport would be operated in segregated mode where one runway will be used for aircraft landing and one for them taking off.
- 13 The proposed passenger and aircraft handling facilities would enable the expanded Airport to accommodate a throughput of 68 million passengers per annum (mppa) by around 2030. This compares to a throughput of approximately 24mppa at the end of 2007 and expected 35mppa if the G1 proposals are successful to make the best use of the existing runway. A second terminal is proposed to be located immediately to the east of the existing terminal. With the expanded Airport there would be a total of 77,450 car parking spaces of which up to 8,230 would be for staff. There is currently permission for 42,700 public car parking with 6,100 for staff of which 26,800 have been implemented.
- 14 A number of Airport buildings are proposed to be developed to provide for the operation of the expanded Airport, including an air traffic control tower, hotels, offices and cargo handling and aircraft maintenance facilities and buildings. Proposed transport infrastructure includes Airport roads and redevelopment of the Airport bus and coach station.
- 15 It is proposed that the G2 Airport Development would be built in phases. The first phase of the construction would start in 2011 and be completed by 2015.
- 16 Two planning applications have been submitted for the G2 Airport Development – a full application for the provision of a runway, associated facilities and operational development in connection with the construction and operation of the expanded airport and an outline planning application for the proposed buildings and related components.
- 17 A further two applications have been submitted in full for the construction of highways with associated landscaping and ancillary works and for a change of use as agricultural land to use for nature conservation and/or landscaping and engineering operations associated with reducing and offsetting the adverse environmental effects of the G2 Airport Project.
- 18 It is these four applications relating to G2 Airport Development that Uttlesford District Council will be considering and that this Council has been asked for its comments on. There are however two further parts to the G2 project.
- 19 **G2 Junction Project** - The G2 Junctions Project proposes new junctions on the M11 and A120 to provide road capacity for access to the expanded Airport. The Highway Agency (HA) has produced an Environmental Statement (ES) for this project and they are currently carrying out a consultation on this ES. Comments on this have to be addressed to the HA.
- 20 **G2 Rail Project** - The G2 Rail Project comprises a second rail link via a second rail tunnel under the existing runway, with additional track on the Stansted branch line from the West Anglia Main Line to Stansted Rail Station, and a fourth platform at the station. This Rail Improvement on the Stansted branch line would enable additional

train services to serve the Airport during the peak periods to carry additional rail passengers to and from the Airport without adversely affecting other rail users according to BAA's documents.

- 21 An application is being made to the Secretary of State for a Transport and Works Order (TWO) known as the Stansted Rail Improvement Order 200() under the Transport and Works Act 1992 for the grant of powers for the construction, operation and maintenance of a proposed fourth rail platform and second rail tunnel and track at Stansted Airport as part of the G2 project. Deemed planning permission is being sought from the Secretary of State for the TWO works.

Response by South Cambridgeshire to the G2 Project

- 22 The Council retains its position set out in March 2006 of not supporting the introduction of a second runway at Stansted because it would create serious environmental damage to the surrounding area and contribute to global warming. Without prejudice to this policy position the Council has considered the G2 proposals.

- 23 It is necessary to consider all three parts of the G2 project in order to provide a response to the four applications submitted to Uttlesford. The improvements to the road and the improvements to the rail service form a fundamental part of the whole project and need to be considered as part of the feasibility of the whole scheme.

- 24 **The second runway** – BAA has chosen the segregated mode of runway. In their earlier masterplanning there were options for both mixed and segregated modes for the runway and BAA had indicated that mixed mode had the potential for more passenger air transport movements (PATM) but would use more land and have more localized impact on the communities and environment around Stansted. It is for these reasons that the segregated mode was the one preferred by this Council when the Masterplan was considered in May 2006 and so it is to be welcomed that this has been chosen by BAA.

- 25 **Suggested response by South Cambridgeshire District Council –**
The Council welcome the decision by BAA to opt for a segregated mode runway since this has a reduced environmental impact.

- 26 **Air movements** - The second runway is to be the same length as the existing runway, which means that the runway has capacity to accommodate the largest aircraft, which are likely to be flying in 2030 (Airbus A380). This could have implications for South Cambridgeshire in terms of what aircraft would be flying over this district.

- 27 NATS are currently carrying out a consultation on changes to the way in which aircraft fly over eastern England and are proposing two new holds to be located above this district. – one of these holds would be for Stansted arrivals. If the second runway is built further changes would be needed to be done to control aircraft movements to and from the expanded airport. According to BAA it would be premature to apply for changes now . They would have to be done as close as possible in time to the date when they are required to be implemented- the second runway could be operational by 2015. BAA would therefore apply closer to this date to ensure that proposals when implemented take account of the most recent developments in technology and airspace management.

- 28 As part of the current planning application BAA have prepared a full Environmental Assessment to give details of the environmental effects associated with a second runway and they have received advice from NATS about where aircraft will be likely

to fly with a second runway in operation. It would appear that aircraft arrivals from the proposed West Stansted hold (called Berry) would travel from the hold in a southeasterly direction before turning towards the southwest in approximately the Sudbury area. This would result in an additional corridor of noise to the east of South Cambridgeshire.

29 Suggested response by South Cambridgeshire District Council –

The Council is concerned that the capacity of the new runway is being designed to allow the use of large aircraft. With the need for NATS to consider further changes to aircraft movements as a result of the second runway this could result in larger aircraft as well as larger numbers of aircraft flying over this district.

30 *In considering the current consultation by NATS this Council is concerned that the intermittent noise pattern of aircraft using the West Stansted hold will disturb the communities living and working below the West Stansted hold and the implication of greater numbers of aircraft associated with a second runway will add to the disturbance.*

31 Increased capacity - The expanded airport would be able to accommodate 68 million passengers per annum (mppa) by 2030 compared to the current capacity of 24mppa at the end of 2007. If the G1 project – making the best of the existing runway- were approved 35mppa would be allowed. This increase in passenger numbers can be related to an increase in air movements to and from the airport. The increase is shown on the following chart.

	2007 Aircraft movements	Passenger numbers per million per annum (mppa)	2015 Aircraft movements	Passenger numbers per million per annum (mppa)	2030 Aircraft movements	Passenger numbers per million per annum (mppa)
Current use of single runway	179,000	24mppa				
Making the best of the existing runway.	-	-	274,200	35mppa	275,000	35mppa
Development case – Second runway	-	-	316,500	38.5mppa	495,016	68mppa

32 In the data included in the masterplanning consultation in 2006 by BAA the forecast for 2030 with a segregated runway was for 63mppa. There has been an increase in the forecast of 5mppa.

33 The increased capacity of Stansted would have two fundamental implications for South Cambridgeshire.

- The increased numbers of aircraft movements would mean more aircraft above this district, particularly concentrated over the area of the West Stansted hold. The communities in this area could be affected by the noise of these craft.
- Increased passenger numbers would have an impact on the infrastructure of the wider area. Whether the passengers are getting to or from the airport by

car, train or coach the road and rail systems will experience an increased usage. The wider community of South Cambridgeshire will therefore be affected by the proposals.

34 It is therefore necessary to consider these two aspects of the scheme in more detail.

35 **Noise implications** – In the ATWP it specifically states that a key advantage of a new runway at Stansted would be that substantial additional capacity would be achieved with a lower noise impact. It goes on to say that development of Stansted should therefore be subject to stringent limits on the area affected by aircraft noise, with the objective of incentivising airlines to introduce the quietest suitable aircraft as quickly as is reasonably practicable. When this Council considered the BAA Masterplan for a second runway in March 2006 there were a number of concerns expressed about noise since it was recognised that this was going to be one of the main impacts of the expansion of the Airport to this district. The Council was not able to make an adequate assessment of the noise at that stage because the information provided by BAA was not detailed enough.

36 In considering the noise implications of the G2 scheme BAA has limited its consideration to the effects arising from the use of the runways and has not provided any information on wider noise impacts. This does not seem to follow the advantages of allowing for a second runway as set out in the ATWP. As part of this current application there is no additional information about the wider noise impact as had been requested by this Council in 2006. Specifically information had been asked for noise contours to be provided for 54 dB L_{eq} and 50 dB L_{eq} in line with the World Health Organisation (WHO) recommendations. WHO estimates that the population will be significantly annoyed somewhere between 50 and 55 decibels (and about 10 decibels lower at night) and therefore recommends maximum noise exposure levels of 55dBA L_{eq} daytime and 45dBA L_{eq} night-time in residential gardens to avoid the risk of people being significantly annoyed by noise. This information could have provided a spatial indication of the impact of the proposals. The Council requested that these noise contours should be mapped for years preceding 2030 as well as just 2030. This request has not been carried out.

37 The Council had also asked for more information about air movement both during day and night time as well as flight path data in connection with stacking. This too has not been provided as part of the G2 project. However some of this information has been included in the current NATS consultation but only as it affects the current single runway and its related aircraft movement for the period to 2015 and not forecasts for G1 or for a second runway. The holds are predicted to be used only in peak periods. The numbers of aircraft arriving during this peak hour at Stansted airport in 2009 is forecast to be 33. This figure would presumably be divided between the two Stansted holds in peak periods. Given that aircraft movements will be more than doubling if a second runway comes into operation this will increase the disturbance to local communities.

38 **Suggested response by South Cambridgeshire District Council**

The G2 project does not provide sufficient information for this Council to be able to fully assess the noise impact of the proposals. In 2006 additional information was requested of BAA and this has not been included in the current application. The Council would request that the wider noise implications of the second runway should be considered as part of the current application and that Uttlesford District Council should request that further information be obtained from BAA particularly the noise contour lines for 54 dB L_{eq} and 50 dB L_{eq} . In the absence of this information South Cambridgeshire has no option but to object to the proposed new runway.

- 39 **Infrastructure implications** – If the passenger capacity at Stansted is increased by allowing both the G1 and G2 projects there will need to be improvements to the surface access arrangements for the airport. There is already an infrastructure deficit in the East of England region and the expansion of Stansted will add to the congestion. In May 2007 the Council considered a report on the BAA consultation on the Surface Access Strategy for Stansted. The report is included as Appendix 1.
- 40 Both rail and road capacity will need to be increased if the second runway is constructed. On 3rd March 2008 the Secretary of State for Transport announced plans to take forward work to consider the long-term capacity of the M11 motorway and the West Anglia Main Line train line. This is in recognition of the proposed growth in the draft East of England Plan and the need to support this with effective and sustainable transport links. This work would also need to take account of potential expansion of Stansted airport. This announcement recognised the contribution that BAA was making as a result of G2 project
- 41 **Road** - The road improvements included with the G2 project are restricted to improvements to the airport access from the M11 and A120 - junctions 8 to 8a. The Highway Agency (HA) has stated that without the G2 project these improvements would not be necessary.
- 42 There are also plans by HA to improve the M11 between junctions 6 (at M25) and 8 (at Bishops Stortford). The increased road traffic generated by the G2 project will not all head south to London. There needs to be improvements to the M11 north up to junction 14 as this stretch is also congested and the G2 proposals will contribute to exacerbating existing conditions on the already congested dual-two lane section of the M11. This up grading would also serve the increased population growth that South Cambridgeshire district will be experiencing over at least the next ten to fifteen years. The Secretary of States announcement in March appears to recognise the need to improve the capacity of the M11 and is to be welcomed. However these improvements to the M11 should have been included in the G2 project programme.
- 43 There is currently permission for 42,700 public car parking spaces at Stansted of which 26,800 have been implemented and as part of the G2 proposal this would increase to 77,450. This increase in provision is not consistent with the need to be more sustainable and to encourage passengers and staff to use public transport to access the airport. By making provision for this many cars BAA is actively encouraging non-sustainable modes of transport.
- 44 BAA intend that there be a considerable increase in coach services and within their documents have concentrated on the provision for London passengers as at present some 60% of passengers are from the London area. The coach services are particularly busy in peak periods and in the early and late slots when the rail service is not operating. There must however be consideration to improve and increase the provision of coach services to the wider region to help encourage passengers away from using their cars to get to and from the airport. The current application does not include any new facilities for coach or buses.
- 45 **Rail** - The rail improvements included with the G2 project are to create a second tunnel and build a fourth platform. There are severe constraints on expanding the existing rail service to Stansted if these improvements are not carried out. The G1 project proposes increasing the length of trains to 12 car trains and platform extensions to stations to enable the longer trains to serve them. Cambridge would be one of the stations needing a new island platform to allow 12 car trains to operate. Currently at peak times passengers are unable to board trains since capacity has been reached. The average load factor in autumn 2007 on the Cambridge – Liverpool Street service was 150% and it is identified in the Greater Anglia Route

Utilisation Strategy as needing lengthened trains to be in service at peak times. But the demand forecasts indicate that 12-car operation alone would not provide adequate passenger capacity at outer-suburban stations in the longer term. There is consideration being given to increasing the frequency of the service to London but this could have implications for freight capacity of the line. With the inevitable increases in passengers as a result of a second runway using this service the impact is likely to be detrimental.

46 A public consultation was carried out by BAA in June 2007 on proposals for rail infrastructure schemes to support the G2 project. There was strong support for enhancements to increase capacity on the West Anglia Main Line (WAML) to Stansted Airport. If rail services are to be improved in the long term from Stansted north towards South Cambridgeshire and beyond then this is an opportunity for increasing capacity to the rail service to the north by adding track northwards to serve the growth corridor and provide an improved service from the north to Stansted for passengers to the airport. The Council put forward this suggestion to BAA in May 2007 and this should have been included in the G2 project.

47 **Timescale** – There is a need for both the road and rail improvements to be carried out before a second runway can be operational. In considering the Surface Access Strategy the Council expressed concern over the timescale for the delivery of the surface access proposals in particular the highway improvements. The BAA anticipate the second runway will be operational by 2015, whilst the Highways Agency believes widening of the M11 will be inevitable in the period 2015-2020. The second runway should not be permitted until adequate access measures are in place.

48 **Suggested response by South Cambridgeshire District Council**

The Council supports the improvements proposed to the M11 but recommends that further improvements are needed north to junction 14 since there will be significant additional traffic growth as a result of further development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough corridor as well as from the airport expansion. This should be included in the G2 proposals.

49 *The Council does not support the scale of the increase in car parking provision made in the G2 project. The Council request that additional facilities for coaches and buses be planned for as part of the G2 project and there should be more encouragement for passengers to have the choice to use coach services to get to and from the airport.*

50 *The Council support the increase in rail capacity proposed but BAA should also include in their proposals additional track capacity to be provided north of Stansted to serve the growth corridor and passengers from the north.*

51 *The Council request that until such time as vital improvements have been made to both road and rail facilities to serve the airport the proposed second runway should not be permitted.*

Options

52 Considered in this report.

Implications

53	Financial	None
	Legal	None
	Staffing	None

Risk Management	The cumulative effects of having a second runway with the increased disturbance from aircraft flying over the district and from the increased congestion in journeys by passengers on both road and rail transport going to and from the expanded airport could result in the urbanisation of this rural district.
Equal Opportunities	None

Consultations

- 54 Consultation has taken place with the Council's Environmental Health officer and with County Council officers.

Effect on Corporate Objectives and Service Priorities

55	Work in partnership to manage growth to benefit everyone in South Cambridgeshire now and in the future
	-
	Deliver high quality services that represent best value and are accessible to all our community
	-
	Enhance quality of life and build a sustainable South Cambridgeshire where everyone is proud to live and work
	There are implications for the quality of life of residents if a second runway were to be constructed at Stansted with the associated increase in aircraft flying over this district as well as increase road and rail traffic being generated by increased passengers to and from that enlarged airport.

Conclusions/Summary

- 56 The proposal to have a second runway at Stansted with the associated increase in passenger numbers and aircraft movements will have detrimental implications for South Cambridgeshire as set out in this report. The Council therefore retains its position of not supporting a second runway.

Recommendations

- 57 Cabinet recommends responding to Uttlesford District Council as follows:
- (a) The South Cambridgeshire District Council retains its position set out in March 2006 of not supporting a second runway at Stansted, which would create serious environmental damage to the surrounding area and contribute to global warming.
 - (b) Without prejudice to that policy position the Council has assessed the current proposal and wishes to comment as follows-
 - (c) The second runway – The Council welcome the decision by BAA to opt for a segregated mode runway since this has a reduced environmental impact.
 - (d) Air movements – The Council is concerned that the capacity of the new runway is being designed to allow the use of large aircraft. With the need for NATS to consider further changes to aircraft movements as a result of the second runway this could result in larger aircraft as well as larger numbers of aircraft flying over this district.

- (e) In considering the current consultation by NATS this Council is concerned that the intermittent noise pattern of aircraft using the West Stansted hold will disturb the communities living and working below the West Stansted hold and the implication of greater numbers of aircraft associated with a second runway will add to the disturbance.
- (f) Increased capacity –Noise implications - The G2 project does not provide sufficient information for this Council to be able to fully assess the noise impact of the proposals. In 2006 additional information was requested of BAA and this has not been included in the current application. The Council would request that the wider noise implications of the second runway should be considered as part of the current application and that Uttlesford District Council should request that further information be obtained from BAA particularly the noise contour lines for 54 dB L_{eq} and 50 dB L_{eq}. In the absence of this information South Cambridgeshire has no option but to object to the proposed new runway.
- (g) Infrastructure implications - The Council supports the improvements proposed to the M11 but recommends that further improvements are needed north to junction 14 since there will be significant additional traffic growth as a result of further development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough corridor as well as from the airport expansion. This should be included in the G2 proposals.
- (h) The Council does not support the scale of the increase in car parking provision made in the G2 project. The Council request that additional facilities for coaches and buses be planned for as part of the G2 project and there should be more encouragement for passengers to have the choice to use coach services to get to and from the airport.
- (i) The Council support the increase in rail capacity proposed but BAA should also include in their proposals additional track capacity to be provided north of Stansted to serve the growth corridor and passengers from the north.
- (j) The Council request that until such time as vital improvements have been made to both road and rail facilities to serve the airport the proposed second runway should not be permitted.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

BAA documents relating to the G2 proposals. These can be accessed on-line http://www.stanstedairport.com/portal/page/StanstedFuture%5ESecond+runway%5EDocuments%5EPlanning+Applications+%28Mar+2008%29/8d7b2375d6b38110VgnVCM20000039821c0a_/448c6a4c7f1b0010VgnVCM200000357e120a_/

Stansted Generation 2 Airport Access from M11 and A120 – Highways Agency 2008

TCN Airspace Change Proposals - NATS consultation 2008.

Contact Officer: Alison Talkington /Senior Planning Policy Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713182