REPORT TO:	**FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**	**AGENDA ITEM:**	11
DATE OF MEETING:	**28 NOVEMBER 2002**	**CATEGORY: DELEGATED**	
REPORT FROM:	**DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE**	**OPEN PARAGRAPH NO:**	
MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT:	**RICHARD GROVES (EXT. 5738)**	**DOC:**	
SUBJECT:	**THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF AIR TRANSPORT IN THE UK CONSULTATION EXERCISE**	**REF:**	
WARD(S) AFFECTED:	**ALL**	**TERMS OF REFERENCE:**	**C:/myfiles/richard/committees/FM5**

1.0 Recommendations

1.1 It is recommended that the Department for Transport be informed of the views of the Working Panel as listed below and supported by the conclusions set out in this report:

(i) The presence of EMA yields substantial economic benefits both for the region and for South Derbyshire and it is therefore recognised that there is a need to accommodate controlled growth in air transport.

(ii) The development of an air transport strategy for the UK and its regions should take full account of the Government's national sustainability objectives and policies. Without adequate controls any expansion of activity at EMA will have a major detrimental impact on the surrounding communities and this needs to be recognised and addressed. Whilst recognising the constraints on Government action, such as international treaties, every effort should be made to ensure that air transport pays its full environmental impact cost on the basis of the "polluter pays" principle. The Government should therefore give consideration to all available fiscal and capacity measures in order to secure the most sustainable level and pattern of national and regional airports capacity. The strategy should be based on an assessment of Environmental Capacity, particularly in regard to noise, which will determine the scale of acceptable growth.

(iii) The SEC scenario is opposed. The level of constraint envisaged for the South East airports in this scenario is unrealistic, given the pressures for growth, and excessive constraint in that region may disadvantage national economic prospects. It is therefore considered that any additional capacity to meet demand arising from the South East should be met through the expansion of airports within that region rather than in the Midlands or elsewhere in the UK.

(iv) The provision of a second runway at EMA is opposed on the following grounds:

a) The case for additional runway capacity at EMA is highly tenuous in that it assumes an unrealistic level of constraint on the expansion of airport capacity in the South East together with failure to provide for more pressing expansion needs elsewhere in the Midlands. Even then the development of a second

runway is a long-term and highly uncertain prospect, bringing with it a period of protracted blight for local communities.

b) Such a proposal would have a severe and unacceptable impact on the environment, amenities and character of the settlements and communities adjoining the airport in terms of noise, air quality, potential road congestion and urbanisation pressures.

c) EMA is currently not well served by public transport and, given its location, is likely to continue to perform relatively poorly in terms of the objectives of national integrated transport policy.

d) The scale of employment growth envisaged under the second runway option is such that it is likely to lead to severe overheating in the local and sub-regional labour and housing markets.

(v) There is a need for substantial improvements in relation to surface access to EMA , in particular public transport, which should be addressed regardless of which option is selected as the basis for policy for the future development of the airport.

(vi) The omission from the consultation documents of fully detailed forecasts for noise generated by night flights at EMA is seen as a significant failing. The 90 dBA SEL footprint information included does not provide a sufficient basis for the assessment of noise impact. The noise from night flights should be described using Laeq contours in order to allow proper consideration of the implications of the various options.

(vii) An appropriate level of control should be applied to night flying activities, providing a consistent approach to the assessment and control of environmental detriment, particularly in relation to noise.

(viii) The continued presence of "Chapter 2" aircraft is responsible for much of the noise generated at EMA and their use should be phased out, particularly if activity at the airport is to expand.

2.0 Purpose of Report

2.1 The purpose of the report is to seek a response to the Department of Transport consultation exercise "The Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom".

2.2 At Finance and Management Committee on 5th September, it was resolved to establish a Working Panel to consider a response to the consultation exercise to be presented to a later meeting of the Finance and Management Committee. The views of the Panel, which met on 24th October and 6th November, 2002, are reflected in the conclusions and recommendations of this report.

3.0 Executive Summary

3.1 The consultation document identifies a number of national policy scenarios and presents options for developing aviation capacity in the Midlands. These comprise: maximising use of existing runways; developing second runways at Birmingham (BHX) and East Midlands Airports (EMA) and the creation of a completely new airport between Rugby and Coventry.

3.2 All options envisage significant growth in freight and passenger flights at EMA with substantial economic, environmental and amenity implications for South Derbyshire residents. The development of a second runway would have the greatest impact, particularly if coupled with a policy of constraint in airport capacity growth in the South East region.

3.3 This report concludes that the major impacts on South Derbyshire in all cases will comprise: economic growth including employment creation; noise disturbance caused by aircraft; highway congestion and/or improvements in transport infrastructure and urbanisation pressures.

4.0 Detail

4.1 The Department of Transport has identified the following main aims for the consultation exercise:

- To present key information, including forecasts, implications and options;
- To allow an informed debate of the issues and options; and
- To facilitate the choice of strategy for the future of airport development in the region and in the UK as a whole to the year 2030.

Consultation documents have been prepared for each region of the UK setting out issues that have implications for the development of air services and airports. The views of all interested parties are sought. The full suite of Midlands consultation documents has been placed in the Members' Room for reference. These can also be viewed on the Department for Transport website at www.aviation.dft.gov.uk.

4.2 The consultation document raises the following key issues for airports strategy in the Midlands which the Government wishes to see considered:

- Should new capacity be provided at Midlands airports over next 30 years?
- What measures are needed to control / mitigate the environmental impact of traffic growth and capacity improvements?
- How should other key issues be addressed?

4.3 Responses to this exercise will inform the preparation of the forthcoming UK Air Transport White Paper. The White Paper will consider aviation's effect on:

- people (air passengers and those whose lives are affected by aviation);
- the economy;
- the environment;
- regional development; and
- integration with surface transport

Regional Overview

4.4 Around 180 million passengers passed through UK airports in 2000 of which 10 million used the Midlands major airports. If unconstrained the national total is forecast to grow to between 400 and 600 million by 2030. The mid-point of the forecast, 500 million, has been used as a basis for the evaluation of regional air services. It is anticipated that demand at the main Midlands airports could rise to 60 million by 2030.

4.5 The three principal airports in the Midlands are BHX (handling approx. 7.5 million passengers and 10,000 tonnes of freight in 2000), EMA (approx. 2.25 million

passengers and 179,000 tonnes of freight) and Coventry (Approx. 4000 passengers and 5,000 tonnes of freight).

4.6 In terms of passenger services Charter operations make up over 80% of passenger flights at EMA, but BHX has a much higher profile in terms of scheduled flights.

4.7 EMA is now third largest freight airport in the UK after Heathrow and Gatwick. Little bellyhold traffic (i.e. freight carried in the hold of scheduled passenger flights) is now handled at EMA and most of the airport's tonnage is freighter traffic.

4.8 Airports are now recognised as major employment generators, as witnessed by the direct employment found at the two main airports in the Midlands:

- EMA: 5,100 jobs;
- BHX: 7,200 jobs.

Policy Mechanisms

4.9 The consultation document identifies a number of "policy mechanisms" which could be used to promote or constrain the demand for air transport and/or terminal capacity, as follows:

- Using the planning system to prevent, constrain or facilitate airport development.
- Actively encouraging air services to use regional airports through marketing etc.
- Encouraging or restricting access to regional airports through slot allocation in the South East.
- Providing financial support and/or the regulatory environment to encourage or restrict investment.
- Restrictive regulatory or voluntary frameworks (eg emissions, noise).
- Competition verses complementarity (ie should there be competition between regional airports or should each specialise).
- Improving surface access to airports.
- Expanding or restricting available airspace.

Policy Scenarios

4.10 Background studies have been undertaken to inform policy making on aviation development in three stages. Regional Air Studies were undertaken to gather information, consider potential policy options and highlight major issues that needed to be addressed in each region. This work was further refined through the Regional Air Study Co-ordination exercise (RASCO) which included consideration of cross-regional issues. Further studies were then undertaken to examine long term runway capacity in the regions.

4.12 Four alternative National Policy Scenarios are identified:

- The RASCO Reference Case (RRC) - involves the continuation of current policies and therefore represents a baseline for evaluation. New development is permitted where the balance between economic, social and environmental considerations is acceptable, with environmental impacts mitigated as far as reasonably practicable.
- The South East Constrained Scenario (SEC) - capacity at London airports is constrained whilst regional airports are permitted to grow in line with demand. Short/medium haul flights (including low cost and charter) would be expected to shift to regional airports or be lost to the UK.

- The UK-Wide Constrained Scenario (UKC) - capacity is constrained throughout the UK. Development is restricted to that which has already been supported in the planning system. Environmental impacts are limited as far as possible.
- The Facilitating Growth Scenario (FG) - all airports in the UK are permitted to grow in line with demand. Growth in demand is encouraged.

4.13 In addition two alternative spatial strategies are considered:

- The Fly Local Scenario (FL) - encourages growth at all regional airports to meet as much demand locally as is possible.
- The Concentrated Growth Scenario (CGS) - growth is focused on a limited number of airports within a region in order to allow those airports to attract services to a wider range of destinations with increased frequencies.

4.57 The RASCO appraisal suggested that there was a case for examining the potential for developing additional runway capacity to serve the Midlands, focusing on Birmingham and East Midlands airports. The following options have therefore been considered in detail:

- The maximum use of existing runways at Birmingham and East Midlands Airport.
- A new runway close to the existing runway at Birmingham.
- A new runway further away from the existing runway at Birmingham.
- A second runway at East Midlands Airport South of the village of Diseworth.

Consideration is also given to the establishment of a new airport near Coventry.

East Midlands Airport (EMA)

4.14 The passenger forecasts for EMA produced for the various scenarios may be summarised as follows:

Policy Scenario	**Passengers per annum**
2000 actual at EMA	2.2
RRC 2030 / Max. use of single runway at EMA	15.0
RRC 2030 / With second runway at EMA (no second runway at BHX)	15.4
SEC 2030	20.0
SEC 2030 / With second runway at EMA (no second runway At BHX)	30.6
UKC 2030	3.6
FG 2030	9.7

4.15 The maximum capacity of EMA within present planning limits is put at 12.5m passengers per annum (mmpa). If the airport expands beyond these limits, but excluding the development of a second runway, a maximum capacity of 15 mmpa is anticipated.

4.16 Under the RRC scenario traffic growth EMA is expected to reach 15 mmpa in 2030 if additional runway capacity is provided elsewhere in the Midlands. Without this extra capacity a second runway could be required at EMA sometime after 2024.

4.17 The SEC scenario produces very high traffic forecasts for Midlands airports, with the capacity of the single runway at EMA being exceeded in 2025 even with additional provision elsewhere in the Midlands. Without such capacity this position could be reached between 2017 and 2021.

4.18 The UKC scenario produces significantly lower forecasts for both BHX and EMA, whilst the main effect of the FG scenario would be the expansion of airport capacity in the South East. As a result, traffic growth at EMA would be significantly lower than under the RRC or SEC scenarios.

Birmingham Airport (BHX)

4.19 Although the consultation document provides the full range of forecasts for BHX, the following table shows the impact on BHX of the second runway at EMA and BHX wide-spaced runway options:

	BHX/second runway at EMA	**Wide spaced runaway at BHX**
	mmpa	**mmpa**
2000 actual	7.5	7.5
2030 RRC	20.6	35.8
2030 SEC	20.9	44.4

4.20 The existing single runway at BHX is expected to reach capacity between 2012 and 2017 under the RRC scenario. With a second close-spaced runway BHX would be full before 2030 under the RRC scenario and before 2020 under SEC. A wide-spaced second runway at BHX would accommodate RRC growth beyond 2030 but under the SEC scenario capacity would be exceeded well before 2030.

New Airport

4.21 The consultation document considers the option of building a new airport between Rugby and Coventry, coupled with the closure of BHX (by 2011). EMA would remain open, but without a second runway.

4.22 The following table shows the traffic forecast for the new airport and EMA if the new airport is built:

New airport scenario	**Passengers (mmpa)**
EMA 2000 actual	2.2
EMA 2030 forecast	8.9
New airport 2030	63.9

4.23 It can be seen that the forecast increases in passenger traffic at EMA (by 2030) would be lower than those envisaged under the EMA maximum use, RRC and SEC scenarios.

Air Freight

4.24 The freight forecasts for EMA refer to the RRC and SEC scenarios, with or without a second runway at the airport (mtpa = millions tonnes per annum):

Policy scenario	**mtpa**
2000 actual at EMA	0.18
RRC 2030 forecast	2.6
SEC 2030 forecast	3.1

4.25 If a new airport were to be built at Rugby the freight traffic forecast (to 2030) for EMA is significantly below those of the RRC and SEC scenarios.

New airport scenario	**Freight (mtpa)**
EMA 2000 actual	0.18
EMA 2030 forecast	1.9

New airport 2030	1.4

Detailed Proposals at East Midlands Airport

4.26 The consultation document contains indicative plans of the two options for the expansion of facilities at EMA..

4.27 The Maximum Use option envisages substantial further development within the existing airport limits to the south of the existing runway. In addition a north-south taxiway would run from the runway to open up land to the south of the A453 for further air freight terminal development and parking provision.

4.28 The wide-spaced second runway would be parallel with the existing runway and linked to it by means of a north-south taxiway, with substantial airfreight terminal development and parking provision. The A453 would be re-routed to the west of Isley Walton, with a link road to the A50 provided to the west of Castle Donington.

4.29 A third option, involving the provision of a second runway to the north of Diseworth, was also produced but this does not form part of the current consultation.

Evaluation of Options and Assessment of Impacts

4.30 The consultation document looks at the impacts of the various options in a number of ways.

Financial appraisal

4.31 A financial appraisal has been provided which seeks to define a financial internal rate of return (FIRR) for each of the options for providing additional runway capacity:

Option	**Financial internal rate of return (FIRR) (%)**
Birmingham	
RRC with close-spaced second runway	8.3
RRC with wide-spaced second runway	7.2
SEC with close-spaced second runway	9.5
SEC with wide-spaced second runway	10.3
East Midlands	
RRC with second runway	2.0
SEC with second runway	6.8
New Airport	9.0

4.32 The FIRRs for the EMA options are significantly lower than those of the BHX options. The FIRR for New Airport is similar to those of the BHX SEC options.

Benefit/cost ratio

4.33 The consultation document also seeks to quantify wider economic benefits for the various new runway options and provides the following benefit/cost ratios (BCR):

Option	**BCR**
Birmingham	
RRC with close-spaced second runway	1.91
RRC with wide-spaced second runway	1.83
SEC with close-spaced second runway	2.31
SEC with wide-spaced second runway	3.03-3.08
East Midlands	
RRC with second runway	0.46

SEC with second runway	0.87
New Airport	1.6-1.7

4.34 The EMA options produce very poor benefit/cost ratios when compared with those at BHX and the New Airport proposal.

Employment

4.35 The consultation document provides forecasts of the additional jobs created at EMA under each of the options:

	Additional employment b 2030		
	Direct	**Indirect**	**Total**
RRC/Maximum use at EMA	26,300	7,700	34,000
RRC with second runway at EMA	33,600	9,900	43,500
SEC with second runway at EMA	42,700	12,600	55,000

4.36 The scale of the employment increase envisaged, even under the Maximum Use scenario, is considerable.

Noise

4.37 An assessment has been made of the noise implications of the EMA proposals by North West Leicestershire District Council's Noise Consultant. His report is attached at Annexe 1.

4.38 The consultation document presents a range of forecasts for increases in air transport movements (ATMs) which it refers to as being up to five times the existing number. However, the consultant considers that in terms of the actual numbers of air transport movements, as indicated in recent planning applications submitted by EMA, the increase is actually about 3.5 times.

4.39 The consultation document includes noise contours for the RRC scenario, assuming aircraft to be 8 dB quieter than "Chapter 3". The consultant acknowledges that modern aircraft do tend to have noise levels significantly better than "Chapter 3". However, if the –8 dB assumption were not made the contours described below would be very much larger. It should be noted that Much of the noise generated by night flights at EMA arises from the continued use of older and noisier "Chapter 2" aircraft, mainly by freight carriers.

4.40 Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 defines Noise Exposure Categories and deals with new noise sensitive development. Although the guidance does not relate directly to the proposed airport development, it does give an indication of the acceptability of noise levels. The guidance indicates that noise should be taken into account in considering development proposals where noise levels exceed 57 dB Laeq. It further states that above 66 dBLaeq planning permission should not normally be granted.

4.41 In the case of the "Maximum Use/RRC" scenario, within South Derbyshire the whole of Melbourne, Kings Newton and the surrounding rural area would fall within the daytime 57 dB Laeq contour (1999 mid year population estimate 4,900). This compares to the present situation where the two settlements lie almost entirely beyond the contour. The whole of the built up parts of Melbourne and Kings Newton would lie within the 60 dB Laeq contour and the majority of Kings Newton would fall within the 63 dB Laeq contour.

4.42 Under the "Second Runway/RRC" scenario, within South Derbyshire the whole of Melbourne, Kings Newton, Ticknall (1999 mid year population estimate 690) and part of Stanton by Bridge (1999 mid year population estimate 230) would fall within the 57 dB Laeq contour. Almost all of the built up part of Melbourne and Kings Newton and half of Ticknall would fall within the 60 dB Laeq contour and most of Kings Newton would fall within the 63 dB Laeq contour.

4.43 No contours or population/area tables are given for the SEC case, however the effects of this case can be assessed by re-labelling all the contours for the two runway cases 3 dB higher.

4.44 Night noise is assessed in the consultation document only in terms of 90 dBA SEL footprints, which are not sensitive to Air Traffic Movement numbers and therefore do not take account of the numbers of possible night flights.

4.45 At present 75% of air freight ATMs at EMA take place at night. EMA is projected to have between 53000 (Maximum Use/RASCO) and 74000 (New runway/SEC) freight ATMs per annum by 2030 compared to the present total of 18000. The Consultation Document indicates that this translates to 50000 night flights per annum under the SEC scenario.

Air quality

4.46 In April 2001 North West Leicestershire District Council declared an Air Quality Management Area around East Midlands Airport based on an exceedence of the government's objective limit for nitrogen dioxide. No issue was raised in relation to PM10 particulates which were below the objective limit.

4.47 The present consultation documents have produced pollution contours around EMA for nitrogen dioxide and PM10 particulates. The RASCO modelling indicates that except in the case of the proposed second runway, under the RRS scenario there will be no exceedence of the air quality objectives for either of the above pollutants. No direct RASCO modelling was undertaken for the SEC scenario although a correlation with the RRC scenario undertaken by North West Leicestershire District Council has concluded that there will be exceedences of the nitrogen dioxide air quality objective within Leicestershire affecting over 400 residential properties.

4.48 The consultation documents indicate that there will be no exceedence of government air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide or PM10 particulates within South Derbyshire under any of the scenarios presented.

4.49 The document also states that the consultation seeks, as a key issue, to address the measures needed to control and mitigate the environmental impact of growth at airports and that this could be done by improvements to engine technology, emission standards for new aircraft and financial penalties for polluting aircraft.

Surface Access

4.50 Without significant investment in new or improved transport infrastructure all options for EMA expansion are likely to produce severe congestion on the A453, the A42 and at M1 Junctions 23a and 24.

4.51 The consultation document includes estimates for the likely split between transport modes for the various scenarios. The study envisages some sort of fixed link (eg busway or light rail) between the proposed East Midlands Parkway station and the Airport (but only late on under the high growth scenarios), rather than a heavy rail

connection from the Midland Main Line. If a second runway were to be created under the SEC scenario, the consultation document indicates that the Trent and Weston Line would need to be re-opened to serve the large number of passengers forecast.

Option	Car (%)	Rail (%)	Bus (%)	Taxi (%)
BHX close RRC	75	8.2-8.6	1.0	15.4
BHX wide SEC	63.6-76.1	10.7-21.9	1.3-2.4	11.9-12.2
EMA RRC	70.7-80.3	2.1-10.6	2.1-2.9	15.5-15.8
New Airport	N/A	27.0	N/A	N/A

4.52 Members should note that there is currently a considerable degree of uncertainty regarding the proposed East Midlands Parkway station so that reliance on this feature may be open to question at least in the short/medium term.

4.53 BHX is far better placed in terms of its public transport connections and this is reflected in its anticipated public transport percentage compared with that of EMA. In addition, whereas EMA serves the three separate urban centres of Nottingham, Derby and Leicester, BHX and its main urban centres within the West Midlands conurbation are all located along the Rugby-Wolverhampton rail line.

4.54 The high level of rail use predicted for with the New Airport option reflects its location adjoining the West Coast Main Line and the Rugby-Wolverhampton line, coupled with the high proportion of traffic expected to come from the South East.

5.0 Financial Implications

5.1 None that may be identified at this stage.

6.0 Corporate Implications

6.1 None that may be identified at this stage.

7.0 Community Implications

7.1 Aviation can generate significant community benefits through economic activity leading to job creation and allows many people to travel over long distances with relative ease and convenience. It can also generate significant disbenefits including noise disturbance, highway congestion and damage to the environment through aircraft emissions and the loss of land.

8.0 Conclusions

8.1 The conclusions set out below represent the views of the Working Panel set up by this Committee to consider a response to the consultation exercise.

Sustainability

8.2 The consultation document acknowledges that growth in air services is likely to lead to an increase in the numbers of people exposed to aircraft noise and emissions, contributing to local air pollution and global warming, and refers to potential mitigation measures. However, there is no direct reference to "sustainability" in the consideration of the principles of air transport versus detriment. The concern is that large scale expansion of activity at the airport will deplete resources significantly without putting anything back to sustain the environment for future generations.

8.3 It is considered that a sustainable approach to determining an Aviation Strategy should be based upon:

- An assessment of demand based upon

- The application of normal taxes on all sections of the aviation industry
- A true application of the 'polluter pays' principle proportionate to the degree of detriment.

- An assessment of Environmental capacity (especially in relation to noise and effects on residents) which will in effect determine the maximum acceptable levels of growth.
- The development of necessary air services to minimise the need for surface travel to airports where this is not in conflict with the environmental capacity at any particular airport.

8.4 Whilst there are general guidelines in planning policy guidance notes which advise, for example, the circumstances where new housing should not be permitted if it is likely to be subjected to particular levels of noise, there is no provision to apply this approach in reverse. In other words there is no means of limiting noise generated by airports to a level which may be regarded as "acceptable". It is considered that this should be addressed by Government before any national or regional air transport policy can be determined.

8.5 At present air transport is considerably subsidised in that it is free from fuel tax which other modes of transport have to bear. In addition, there is no penalty for noise pollution caused by air transport and no effective control over the amount of noise generated by aircraft affecting people living in the vicinity of airports.

8.6 If the "polluter" were made to pay a realistic cost for the detriment and impact caused to people living in the vicinity of airports by means of some form of compensation, then the rapid growth in air transport for both passengers and freight may not be as high as currently predicted. The possibility of regularising demand in this way is mentioned in the consultation documents. However, even if air transport operators had to pay the full environmental cost (however that were to be calculated in terms of detriment to people and effects on the atmosphere) there would still need to be absolute limits of detriment which should not be allowed to be exceeded.

8.7 The difference between the RRC scenario and the UKC scenario as applied to EMA (11.4 mmpa in 2030) is very substantial and suggests that there may be considerable scope for the selective use of constraint measures which could significantly depress passenger traffic by 2030. It is therefore considered that Government should give detailed consideration to the use of a range of such measures for this purpose.

Planning Period

8.8 Thirty years is a very long time to plan for, although the consultation document argues that this is necessary given the strategic nature of the issue and the scale of investment required. However, such an approach will inevitably involve uncertainties, especially if the major investments are not expected to be required until the end of the period. In such circumstances the areas concerned could face a protracted period of planning blight.

Policy Scenarios

8.9 EMA is an important economic asset for the East Midlands region and for South Derbyshire and it is therefore recognised that there will be a need to accommodate controlled growth in demand for air transport.

8.10 It is considered that the level of constraint envisaged for the South East airports in the SEC scenario is unrealistic given the pressures for growth and the demand for long haul international flights. Much of the traffic handled at these airports is for

international business purposes and excessive constraint may disadvantage national economic prospects. It is therefore considered that demand arising from the South East should be met through additional capacity at airports within that region.

Additional Capacity in the Midlands

8.11 A second runway would only be required at EMA under the SEC or under the RRC scenario if no additional capacity is provided elsewhere in the Midlands. Even in these circumstances such a runway could only be justified late on (at the earliest 2024) in the plan period.

8.12 Additional runway capacity at BHX will be required at a much earlier date than at EMA. If this is forthcoming there would be no need for a second runway at EMA except under the SEC scenario.

8.13 Proposals for further incremental growth at EMA with or without a second runway should continue to be considered on the basis of the need for the development set against the harm that will result, with a clear requirement for adequate mitigation.

8.14 The forecasts indicate very substantial growth in freight traffic at EMA under all options considered. However, the absence of night flight controls at EMA may be skewing the market in favour of this airport in the context of competitor airports with such controls. This impact of this disparity needs to be recognised in policy formulation.

Economic impacts

8.15 EMA is an important economic asset for the region as a whole and for South Derbyshire, providing employment opportunities, both directly and indirectly, for residents of the district and thereby supporting local prosperity.

8.16 All options for increased capacity at EMA produce a very substantial increase in employment at and connected with the airport.

8.17 Providing forecasts for local economic needs for the next 30 years is a very difficult and uncertain task. On the basis of current needs, the situation in the District is one where in broad terms the rate of official unemployment is relatively low, with higher unemployment in particular areas, including parts of Swadlincote. The other main areas of concern relate to the quality of the jobs that have been taken up by local people and the degree of out-commuting by local residents to neighbouring areas.

8.18 The economic impact of growth in activity at EMA is likely to be widely dispersed with the creation of new job opportunities throughout the region and particularly in the three cities area. However, improved public transport links with EMA particularly to and from areas of relatively high unemployment in the District would be desirable to enable residents of these areas to compete for any of the new jobs that may be created.

8.19 The substantial increases in employment predicted for EMA would greatly increase the pressure on the local housing market. A report on the consultation exercise by York Aviation Ltd., commissioned by the East Midlands Development Agency considers that:

"There are likely to be significant urbanisation pressures resulting from the growth of the airport. We estimate that the increase in demand for labour attributable to EMA will add between 47% and 64% to the projected excess demand for labour in the

primary catchment area in 2030 and that this will lead to increased in-migration of between 7000 and 11000 workers and additional demand for housing of between 6000 and 9000 dwellings"

8.20 It goes on to say that there would be a need to engage with economic development issues, promote the dispersal of airport related activities away from the EMA site and to manage the response to any urbanisation pressures.

8.21 Among the conclusions of the report are that the economic interests of the East Midlands would be best served by:

- supporting the expansion of a two-runway BHX as a potential regional passenger hub and
- supporting the strategic role of the EMA as a freight hub of national significance

The report indicates that it is not yet clear as to whether a second runway would be required at EMA but concludes that if a need is identified it should be supported.

Noise

8.22 The various traffic forecasts (except UKC) show significantly greater noise impact than at present, with the higher forecasts (RRC and SEC) greatly increasing the numbers of people affected by noise and the SEC forecast significantly increasing the numbers in the very high noise category.

8.23 Noise generated at night and the disturbance caused to local residents is a matter of great concern. The absence of a full noise impact assessment for night flights is therefore seen as a significant failing in the consultation exercise since the 90dB SEL footprint information included does not take account of the numbers of possible night flights. Whilst this is can be used as a sleep disturbance measure, it does not measure annoyance and disturbance factors, which are considerably affected by the number of flights. The noise from night flights should be described using Laeq contours, the same measure as is used in the consultation document for day time flights.

8.24 It is also considered that the use of "Chapter 2" aircraft at EMA should be phased out to be replaced by quieter "Chapter 3" aircraft, particularly if activity at the airport is to expand.

8.25 For Members' information the request made by North West Leicestershire District Council to the then Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions to make East Midlands Airport a "designated aerodrome", as reported to Planning and Economic Development Committee on 22 February 2002 (minute PED/55 refers), has recently been rejected. The designation would have allowed the Secretary of State to prohibit specified aircraft from taking off and landing and to limit the number of occasions on which other aircraft may take off and land during specified periods. In particular this would have offered the opportunity to address the issue of noise generated by night flights. This national policy review provides the opportunity for the further consideration and application of appropriate night flying controls at EMA.

Air Quality

8.26 The air pollution data arising from the SEC scenario with a second runway indicates that air quality will worsen in the vicinity of EMA, indeed the predictive modelling data for the SWSS runway proposal establishes a breach of the UK Air Quality Objectives for nitrogen dioxide, and would result in another Air Quality

Management Area having to be declared in North West Leicestershire. This appears to be contrary to the Government's Air Quality Strategy which primary which aims to achieve an improvement in air quality by reducing certain key pollutants including nitrogen dioxide. The development of a second runway would contradict this strategy as it would be likely to increase, rather than decrease, the number of properties within the area where the nitrogen dioxide objective will not be met.

8.27 Although the evidence presented in the Consultation document does not indicate that air quality objectives will be breached within South Derbyshire, it is considered that air quality within this district could be affected unless the matter is dealt with in an integrated fashion, taking full account of the impact of any emissions arising from an increase in surface access activity.

Surface Access

8.28 The various forecasts indicate that EMA will continue to perform relatively poorly in relation to access by and use of public transport. There is particular concern that activity at EMA should not lead to an increase in traffic volumes through South Derbyshire villages or congestion at M1 junctions 23a and 24. Therefore, in order to mitigate such effects, it is considered that any increase in activity at EMA should be preceded by proportionate and complementary improvements to local transport infrastructure, giving priority to enhanced public transport provision and particularly emphasising rail access and improved links to urban areas.

9.0 Background Papers

The Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: Midlands – A National Consultation	Department for Transport, July, 2002
Future Development of Air Transport in the Midlands: Economic Implications	York Aviation Ltd. on behalf East Midlands Development Agency 21st October, 2002
Report to North West Leicestershire District Council Executive Board – Department of Transport Consultation: The Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom	North West Leicestershire District Council, 29th October, 2002
Comments on Noise Aspects of the DfT Consultation Document	Rupert Taylor on behalf of North West Leicestershire District Council 27th August, 2002