
REPORT TO:	ENVIRONMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE	AGENDA ITEM: 11
DATE OF MEETING:	8 MARCH 2007	CATEGORY: DELEGATED
REPORT FROM:	DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE	OPEN PARAGRAPH NO:
MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT:	RICHARD GROVES (EXTN. 5738)	DOC:
SUBJECT:	EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT MASTER PLAN	REF: u:\Richard\committees\EDS10
WARD(S) AFFECTED:	ALL	TERMS OF REFERENCE: EDS

1.0 Recommendations

- 1.1 (i) That the responses made by East Midlands Airport (EMA) to the representations made by this authority in regard to the Draft Master Plan be noted.
- (ii) That disappointment be expressed in regard to the fact that the Airport has not committed to providing significant additional financial assistance to South Derbyshire residents affected by noise disturbance.
- (iii) That it be stated that concern remains that EMA have not responded in the "Consultation Process and Responses" document to points "e", "h", "i", "m", "u", "v", "bb", "cc" and "hh" made by the Council in its response to the Draft Master Plan as set out at Annexe A.
- (iv) That the change of name from "Nottingham East Midlands Airport" to "East Midlands Airport Nottingham Derby Leicester" be noted and welcomed.
- (v) That support be expressed in regard to the proposal put forward by Save Aston Village Environment (SAVE) for the alteration of the route used by aircraft for training flights at EMA.
- (vi) That proposed arrangements for the on going monitoring of Airport activity and impacts, as set out in para.s 8.26 – 8.29, be approved.
- (vii) That as Highways Authority Derbyshire County Council be requested to address the urgent need for resurfacing of Church Street, Melbourne at the earliest opportunity.
- (viii) That a copy of this report be provided to the following: the Member of Parliament for South Derbyshire, the European Members of Parliament for the East Midlands area, the Civil Aviation Authority, the Government Office for the East Midlands and East Midlands Airport.

2.0 Purpose of Report

- 2.1 (i) To advise members of the responses offered by EMA to the representations made by this authority in regard to the EMA Master Plan and to seek a resolution in regard to the fact that no comment has been made by the Airport in regard to a number of these.

- (ii) To seek a resolution in regard to the fact that the Airport has not committed to providing significant additional financial assistance to South Derbyshire residents affected by the airport.
- (iii) To seek a resolution welcoming the change of the Airport name.
- (iv) To seek a resolution in regard to a proposal by SAVE for the alteration of the route used by aircraft for training flights at EMA..
- (v) To seek approval of arrangements for the on going monitoring of Airport related activity.
- (vi) To seek a resolution in regard to the submission to the Highway Authority of a request for the resurfacing of Church Street, Melbourne

3.0 Executive Summary

3.1 The report sets out and considers the Airports responses to points made by this authority in its representation on the Draft Master Plan and related changes to the final version of the document, proposes arrangements for the on-going monitoring and reporting of noise-related Airport activity, proposes a resolution in regard to the fact that no financial assistance additional to that proposed in the Draft Master Plan is to be provided to South Derbyshire residents affected by aircraft noise and seeks member support for a proposal for the alteration of the course used for training flights from the Airport to lessen noise disturbance to residents of Aston-on-Trent and Weston-on-Trent.

4.0 Detail

- 4.1 At its meeting of 9 November 2006 the Council considered the response to its request to the Secretary of State for Transport for the designation of EMA under Section 78 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982. It was resolved that a new Working Panel be established to evaluate the final version of the EMA Master Plan, which was subsequently published in December 2006, with a view to preparing a report and recommendations to a future meeting of Environmental and Development Services Committee (minute CL/83 refers).
- 4.2 The Working Panel met on 17 January and 21 February 2007. The Panel agreed not to recommend that the Council pursue designation of the airport for the time being as it was felt that this would not necessarily lead to a reduction in noise levels, as explained in section 3.4 of the Plan, and could have an adverse impact on community liaison and the ability to negotiate locally on issues of concern. However it was agreed that it would be important to seek the regular provision of up to date information on an on-going basis to enable the monitoring of Airport performance in relation to the Master Plan.
- 4.3 It was considered that members should be appraised of the Airport's responses to the issues raised by the Council in commenting on the Draft Master Plan, as agreed by Finance and Management Committee on 16th May 2006 (minute FM/144 refers). The responses, taken from the document "East Midlands Airport Master Plan: Consultation Process and Responses", are set out at Annexe A. The Airport has not responded to representations individually in most cases but rather has grouped similar comments together and provided a general response.
- 4.4 In regard to point (v) the Panel considered that the Airport should be notified of the Council's disappointment in regard to the fact that the Master Plan included no commitment to providing significant additional financial assistance to mitigate the impact of airport operations on South Derbyshire residents at present. It should be noted however that the nighttime noise contour forecast for 2016 suggests that most dwellings in Kings Newton and a number in the northern part of Melbourne will be eligible to receive the basic Sound [Page 21 of 26](#) Grant Scheme at that time. This will

represent a maximum of £3000 for houses in the 55dB_{LAEQ,8h} contour, a £1000 increase above the previous level of assistance available to houses falling within this category.

- 4.5 The Panel considered information submitted in support of a request made to the Airport by the local pressure group Save Aston Village Environment (SAVE) for the alteration of the route used by aircraft for training flights. At present the route passes over both Aston-on-Trent and Weston-on-Trent and SAVE have compiled evidence to demonstrate that realignment of the route to avoid the direct over-flying of the two villages could result in a significant reduction in noise disturbance to residents. Annexe B shows the present alignment of the training flight path. The plans at Annexes C and D show the paths of flights on 13 and 15 September 2006 respectively, whilst the graphs at Annexes E and F show hourly noise levels at Weston-on-Trent on each of these days. It can be seen that more flights passed directly over Weston on 13 than on 15 September and that noise levels in the village were correspondingly higher on the first day than on the second. SAVE have therefore requested that the alignment of the flight path be formally amended by moving it to the west and north. The Panel agreed that the Committee should be asked to support SAVE in its request.
- 4.6 It was considered that the recent change of name from “Nottingham East Midlands Airport” to “East Midlands Airport Nottingham Derby Leicester” should be noted and welcomed as recognising that the airport serves the region as a whole, is situated in Leicestershire and does not lie in particularly close proximity to Nottingham, Derby being nearer.

5.0 Financial Implications

- 5.1 None.

6.0 Corporate Implications

- 6.1 Airport related activity has implications for the following Key Aims of the Council’s Corporate Plan:

- Safer and Healthier Communities
- Prosperity for All

7.0 Community Implications

- 7.1 Airport related activity has implications for the following themes of the South Derbyshire Community Strategy:

- Healthy communities
- A vibrant economy
- A sustainable environment

8.0 Conclusions

Presentation

- 8.1 The amalgamation of similar comments and provision of generalised responses in the “Consultation Process and Responses” document makes it impossible to gauge the weight of opinion in relation to individual issues and to identify the parties to whom particular points of view may be attributed. Such matters are addressed selectively in the “Main Themes” section of the report, but the failure to follow this approach on a comprehensive basis renders the document less than transparent and presents difficulties when searching for responses to particular submitted comments.

It is disappointing that a number of comments made by the Council have not been acknowledged in the document.

Air Traffic Forecasts

- 8.2 It is disappointing that the Airport has responded to points “g” and “h” at Annexe A simply by citing the forecasts contained in the 2003 Air Transport White Paper. This is compounded by the absence of a response to point “i”, relating to the potential of the airport to help to serve the air freight needs of the South East region. The strategic approach embodied in that document seeks to accommodate demand arising from the South East through the provision of additional runway capacity within that region. The rate of growth in air freight traffic at EMA to date has fallen significantly short of the White Paper forecast and to seek to boost this by accommodating demand from the South East is inconsistent with Government policy.

Second Runway

- 8.3 The amendment to the text of the Master Plan on this issue (points “j”, “k” and “l”) more accurately reflects the stance taken in the White Paper, which indicates that the decision not to provide a second runway by 2030 will be kept under review if growth at the airport exceeds forecasts.

Noise

- 8.4 The omission of a commitment to the provision of a purpose-built engine testing facility (point “n”) is disappointing particularly as the decision appears to have been made purely on the grounds of financial cost to EMA and having no regard to the adverse impact on its neighbours.
- 8.5 It is disappointing that the Airport has declined to take further steps beyond those referred to in Section 7.2.5 of the report to address the ratio of day to night time flights in favour of the day time (point “p”) in order to prevent the night-time 57 dBLAeq 8 hour noise footprint achieved in 2004 from growing any further.
- 8.6 The fact that the Airport is unwilling to allow independent bodies to set and audit operator incentives and penalties (point “q”) is disappointing, however it is encouraging that EMA has since September 2006 been making radar track information for all aircraft operating in the vicinity of the Airport available via the Airport website. The Plan has been amended to indicate that from April 2007 noise penalty limits will be simplified and made more stringent by a margin of 2 decibels. The penalty for infringing a maximum noise limit will be increased from £500 to £750 for an infringement of 1 decibel, with an unchanged incremental charge of £150 for every decibel thereafter. Information submitted to the Independent Consultative Committee indicates that the changes were in fact implemented from 1 January this year. The changes in penalty levels are considered to be too small to lead to any significant reduction in noise infringement levels.
- 8.7 The concession made in relation to training flights (point “s”) varies from that requested by this authority in that such activity will be restricted to airlines operating from the airport, rather than to flights required for familiarisation with the EMA site. Theoretically this would allow the training of pilots who would not necessarily fly to or from EMA in the course of their day-to-day work.
- 8.8 The EMA response to the request for the noise benefit of the proposed runway extension to be quantified (point “t”) is disappointing. The Master Plan indicates that the noise forecasts presented assume implementation of the extension, yet planning permission for this has not yet been granted. The basis of the forecasts is thus

unreliable in this regard and data reflecting a “no extension” scenario should be included for comparison.

- 8.9 It is disappointing that no response has been made to the Council’s request that the Airport undertake to review the costs associated with the provision of sound insulation measures in order to allow the adequacy of the grant scheme to be measured (point “u”).
- 8.10 The Airport has not responded to the Council’s request for all dwellings within the 54dB LAeq 8Hr noise contour to be eligible for Sound Insulation Grant assistance (point “v”) and although dwellings within the 55dB LAeq 8Hr noise contour as at 2001 are included they have not been individually identified in the Master Plan. The area covered by the contour in 2001 was wider than at present. Together with point “g” (see para. 8.20 below) this will form the basis of a representation to the Airport to express the Council’s disappointment that no additional monies beyond those referred to in the Draft Master Plan will be made available to South Derbyshire residents affected by noise disturbance from airport operations.

Pollution

- 8.11 Whilst the Airport’s commitment to become carbon neutral in terms of ground operations by 2012 is very much to be welcomed it is considered that this is misleading since emissions from the take-off and landing of aircraft are not included in the figure (point “o”).

Surface Access

- 8.12 The new references to the need for local authorities and bus companies to consult widely in relation to the introduction of public transport services to the Airport and comments in the Consultation and Responses document regarding efforts to resolve problems associated with bus services through Melbourne and Kings Newton are to be welcomed (points “f” and “b”). It is understood that as of 25 March 2007 bus service 68 between Derby and Melbourne will run at 30 rather than 20 minute intervals as at present. This is to be welcomed insofar as it is likely to lead to a reduction in noise and traffic congestion in Melbourne and Kings Newton. However it is also understood that service 69 will run three services nightly between 12:00 midnight and 7:00 am from this date using full-size buses to accommodate passenger luggage. The service will be financially subsidised by East Midlands Airport. Noise generated by this activity is likely to lead to loss of amenity for residents of Melbourne and Ticknall, particularly those living along Church Street where road noise impacts are currently exacerbated by severe pothole damage. It is considered that as the local Highway Authority the County Council should be notified of the urgent need for the resurfacing of this road.
- 8.13 The assurance in the Master Plan that the target for public transport access excludes taxi usage (point “w”) is to be welcomed, although the fact that the target has not been raised (point “x”) is disappointing. The identification of the 10% target as minima is unlikely to have any practical impact.
- 8.14 The new reference to partnership working to take forward bus priority measures (points “f” and “z”) is to be welcomed.
- 8.15 The new reference in the Master Plan to a proposal to seek funding for a bus service to Burton-on-Trent (point “cc”) is to be welcomed providing it does not increase the number of existing bus movements.

- 8.16 The decision not to identify and safeguard land for a heavy rail link (point “aa”), is disappointing, particularly as this represents statutory Development Plan policy in the Regional Spatial Strategy for The East Midlands.
- 8.17 It is disappointing that no response has been made to the Council’s request that the Master Plan acknowledge the desirability of a passenger rail loop incorporating the proposed National Forest Line and connecting to the Airport (point “bb”).
- 8.18 Recognition of the link between car parking and public transport provision (point “dd”) and the intention that the scale of additional provision should have regard to the availability of alternative modes of transport is to be welcomed.
- 8.19 The new reference in the Master Plan to the expectation that planned improvements to the M1, A453 and associated junctions should help relieve traffic congestion and make these routes more attractive, thereby providing some relief to Swarkestone Bridge, Kings Newton and Melbourne (point “ee”), is to be welcomed.
- 8.20 Although the reference to the Regional Freight Strategy has been amended, the Master Plan response to this document (point “ff”) remains unsatisfactory. In regard to the transfer of freight from road to rail the Plan simply states that the connection between locating airport-related development nearer to urban areas and a freight railhead should be made. No mention is made of the potential for the transfer of freight from air/road to other modes. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Airport is not identified as the lead partner in the pursuit of these initiatives they are of substantial importance to the development and operation of the Airport and their implications should be identified and properly addressed in the Master Plan.

Employment

- 8.21 The new commitment to addressing a wide range of employment issues including flexible employment opportunities, working with disadvantaged groups, training in basic skills, addressing employability through work experience schemes and assisting in overcoming barriers in returning to work (point “gg”), including child care facilities on site (point “hh”), is to be welcomed.
- 8.22 A new table has been included in section 2.3.2 of the Master Plan, showing the EMA site employees by district of residence. This shows that 536 South Derbyshire residents are employed at the Airport, representing 1 in 74 of total people employed within the district between the ages of 16 and 74 (Source 2001 Census). This is second only to North West Leicestershire where the ratio is 1 in 52.
- 8.23 The Airports broad agreement that land identified for employment development at the EMA site should be for airport-related use only is to be welcomed (point “m”), although no change has been made to the Master Plan in this regard.

Tourism

- 8.24 Strengthened references to working with other agencies, including the National Forest, to stimulate in-bound tourism (point “ii”) are to be welcomed.

Community Relations

- 8.25 It is disappointing that the Airport has declined to raise the level of its contribution to the Community Fund (point “g”). Together with point “v” (see para. 7.9 above) it is recommended that this should form the basis of a representation to the Airport to express the Council’s disappointment that no additional monies beyond those referred to in the Draft Master Plan will be made available to South Derbyshire residents affected by noise disturbance from airport operations.

Monitoring Airport Activity and Impacts

- 8.26 The Master Plan states that progress against commitments will be regularly reported. Noise and track keeping data will be made available for independent scrutiny and since September 2006 has been published on the Airport website for the public to view. Compliance will also be reported to the Independent Consultative Committee.
- 8.27 The Plan indicates that in order to assess the effectiveness of the package of noise amelioration measures the Airport will continue to work with Leicestershire County Council and other councils to consider arrangements for a novel night noise index. The index, if agreed, will be regularly calculated and reported in order to give a picture of the changing noise impact resulting from the Airport's operation.
- 8.28 It is recommended that Council officers seek to liaise with Leicestershire County Council in the consideration of the proposed night noise index to ensure that South Derbyshire is included within the initiative. Information gained through this process can be reported to this Committee.
- 8.29 All available information can be monitored on an on-going basis and significant developments can be reported to this Committee as they arise. In addition as a neighbouring local authority this Council is a consultee in regard to North West Leicestershire District Council planning policies and significant development proposals requiring planning permission at EMA. Any emerging policies or development proposals likely to have an impact on South Derbyshire can therefore be reported to this Committee.

9.0 Background Papers

EMA Master Plan	EMA 2006
Nottingham EMA Draft Master Plan	EMA 2006
Air Transport White Paper	Department for Transport 2003

ANNEXE A

Council Representation	Airport Response	Implications for Master Plan
<p>a) That the presence of the Airport yields substantial economic benefits both for the region and for South Derbyshire and it is recognised that there is a need to accommodate controlled growth in air transport.</p>	<p>A brief reference to representations along these lines is accompanied by the response <i>“Noted with thanks”</i></p>	<p><i>“No change required”</i></p>
<p>b) That the intention to locate new Airport related employment in urban centres and to improve public transport access to the Airport site from areas in need of regeneration, such as the Swadlincote urban area, is welcomed.</p> <p>New public transport services or changes to existing services should not be introduced without prior consultation having regard to the need not to diminish further the amenity in settlements such as Melbourne and Kings Newton.</p>	<p>A brief reference to representations along these lines is accompanied by the response <i>“Noted with thanks”</i></p> <p><i>“Noted. The Airport is not directly responsible for consultation on public transport services. It introduces public transport services as part of a partnership with local authorities and bus operators. We will endeavour to persuade bus operators and local authorities to consult widely before introduction of new services. A note to this effect has been included in Appendix 6.”</i></p> <p>Specifically in relation to Melbourne and Kings Newton the document states: <i>“we are seeking to resolve these local issues with the bus company and other stakeholders”</i></p>	<p><i>“Chapter 2 section 2.3.2 and Appendix 6 has been expanded to address these issues in greater detail”</i></p> <p><i>“Appropriate reference included in Appendix 6”</i></p> <p><i>“No change required to the Master Plan as such. This will be progressed outside the Master Plan process.”</i></p>

<p>c) That the following aircraft noise mitigation proposals be welcomed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of Continuous Descent Approaches to assist in reducing noise disturbance. • The extension of the current night ban on scheduled QC8 and QC16 aircraft to include ad hoc cargo operations • The use of noise preferential departure routings • The proposal to submit noise and track keeping data to independent scrutiny and to make it available to the public via the Airport website 	<p>Support for the package of mitigation measures is accompanied by the response <i>“Noted and welcomed”</i></p>	<p><i>“No change required”</i></p>
<p>d) That the commitment to improved consultation and the increased contribution to the Community Fund be welcomed.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the Airport should make a contribution of £50,000 per year from its own funds and that the contribution of any fines levied on aircraft operators to the Community Fund should be additional to this sum. It is further considered that the Airport Company should make a commitment in the Master Plan to ensuring that its contributions to the Community Fund will be commensurate with future air traffic growth.</p>	<p><i>“Noted and welcomed”.</i></p> <p>A brief reference to comments along these lines is accompanied by the response:</p> <p><i>“Noted at this stage. The airport has already announced a five-fold increase (to £50,000) in its annual contribution to the Community Fund. We think that this is generous but the matter will be kept under review.”</i></p>	<p><i>“No change required”</i></p> <p><i>“No change required at this stage”</i></p>

<p>e) That the Council’s planning service will continue to liaise with the Nottingham East Midlands Airport in respect of development proposals that may have implications for Airport operations including any new noise sensitive development.</p>	<p>No response is made to this comment.</p>	
<p>f) That the acknowledgement of the need to make substantial improvements on the Airport’s present very low public transport usage be welcomed.</p> <p>It is considered that a substantial proportion of the funding for off-site infrastructure needed to encourage modal shift away from the private car should be secured through Section 106 agreements associated with new developments on the airport site, including the proposed new passenger terminal.</p> <p>New public transport services or changes to existing services should have regard to the need to protect local amenity and should not be introduced without prior consultation.</p>	<p>A brief reference to representations along these lines is accompanied by the response “<i>Noted and welcomed</i>”.</p> <p>A brief reference to representations along these lines is accompanied by the response:</p> <p><i>“The Airport works with local Highway Authorities and the Highways Agency to improve public transport infrastructure and provides significant levels of funding.”</i> (see also point “z” below)</p> <p>(see section “b” above)</p>	<p><i>“Our initiatives in this field have been further enhanced in the Master Plan in Chapter 8 and Appendix 6”</i></p> <p><i>“Section on partnership working updated in Appendix 6 to indicate that EMA will continue to work with partners to take forward bus priority measures through the LTP process.”</i></p> <p>(see section “b” above)</p>
<p>g) That the Airport’s assumption that the rate of growth in cargo traffic will accelerate such that the White Paper target for 2016 will be met be questioned and it is considered that it may be</p>	<p><i>“The forecasts have been discussed and endorsed by the Department for Transport and take into account the impact of other airports, fuel costs and the use of larger aircraft. These factors can be</i></p>	<p><i>“This matter will be reconsidered when the Master Plan is reviewed”</i></p>

<p>appropriate to revise the forecast downward. The case for doing so is further reinforced in points (h) and (i) below.</p>	<p><i>reconsidered when the Master Plan is reviewed in five year's time.</i></p>	
<p>h) That the development of more long haul cargo services to connect to short haul routes from other European destinations would appear to offer less potential benefit to the East Midlands economy than would freight routes beginning or ending at the Airport Site. The loss of amenity to local residents caused by such flights may therefore be less justifiable particularly since the aircraft referred to in the Draft Master Plan generate far more noise than most other types.</p>	<p>No response is made to this comment. However the following is offered in response to a suggestion that information should be provided on night cargo by type of cargo, and proportion of UK import, UK export and transit cargo:</p> <p><i>"The Air Transport White Paper supported substantial growth of air cargo at the Airport. Further investigation of this is beyond the scope of the Master Plan."</i></p>	<p><i>"No change required"</i></p>
<p>i) That the transfer of freight operations from the South East would involve the movement of freight over greater distances by land-based transport to reach the Airport. The White Paper proposed additional airport capacity for the South East to assist in accommodating the requirements of that region. Relocation of freight operators is therefore considered both unsustainable and unnecessary.</p>	<p>No response is made to this comment.</p>	<p>No change is made to the Master Plan in this regard.</p>
<p>j) The Council remains firmly opposed to the provision of a second runway at Nottingham East Midlands Airport.</p>	<p><i>"This matter will be kept under review. However there are currently no plans in the foreseeable future to provide a second runway."</i></p>	<p><i>"No change required"</i></p>

<p>k) The suggestion that a second runway may be required toward the end of the period ending in 2030 does not accord with the stance taken in the White Paper and should be deleted. The White Paper did not accept the case for a second runway at the Nottingham East Midlands Airport within this period and added that the decision should be reviewed only if growth at the Airport proved to be more rapid than was expected. Growth to date has not been more rapid than forecast.</p>	<p><i>“We accept that the Master Plan should include reference to the caveats attached to the possible provision of a second runway as set out in the White Paper.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Rewording of section in Chapter 6 to more closely accord with the Air Transport White Paper.”</i></p>
<p>l) That any reconsideration of the second runway proposal must be a matter for a future White Paper.</p>	<p><i>“This matter will be kept under review both in the Air Transport White Paper and in the EMA Master Plan. However, it is not anticipated that a second runway will be required in the lifetime of the Master Plan 2006.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Statement included in Chapter 6”</i></p>
<p>m) Rather than expand the established storage and distribution facilities at the Airport site to accommodate growth in air freight requirements it is considered that whatever part of the existing capacity is not used for that purpose should be reallocated and that additional facilities for non-air freight use should be established in more sustainable locations better related to urban centres and served by rail freight facilities.</p>	<p>No direct response is made to this comment. However the following is offered in relation to a comment that land identified for business development should be for airport related use only:</p> <p><i>“Noted and agreed in broad terms”</i></p>	<p><i>“No change required”.</i></p>

<p>n) That the testing of aero-engines at the Airport site be undertaken in a new purpose built facility so as to mitigate the impact of noise on the local community.</p>	<p><i>“Not accepted. Policies are already in place to minimise ground running at night. Airlines already have a cost incentive to minimise these activities. We will continue to consider the provision of a dedicated engine test area but so far the costs have been disproportionate to the benefits.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Reference made to ongoing consideration of engine testing in Appendix 4.”</i></p>
<p>o) Aircraft take-off and landing should be included as sources of Carbon Dioxide emissions within the Master Plan.</p>	<p><i>“Not accepted as appropriate to the Master Plan. This needs to be considered across the industry and within an international context. As stated on page 30 Appendix 4 EMA ‘will develop and refine its green house inventory in accordance with emerging protocol from within the industry.”</i></p>	<p><i>“No change required”</i></p>
<p>p) The Airport Company should review the ratio of day-time to night-time use in favour of greater day-time use and prevent the night-time 57 dBLAeq 8 hour noise footprint achieved in 2004 from growing any further and thereby breaching its cited intent to “bear down on noise”. This commitment should be embodied both in the Master Plan and in the revised version of the Airport’s “Ten Point Plan” on night noise.</p>	<p><i>“The proportion of night-time use is driven heavily by the demands of our customers, their customers’ businesses and the importance to the economy which has been accepted in the White Paper and supported by many respondents. However we consider that the Airport’s preferred differential charging between day and night-time operations will encourage those who are able to reposition operations to do so.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Information on differential charging between day and night-time operations is provided in the Master Plan.”</i></p>
<p>q) That Aircraft operator incentives and penalty schemes be independently set and audited. The penalty</p>	<p><i>“We consider that setting and auditing incentives and penalties are primarily matters for the Airport.</i></p>	<p><i>“These matters to be progressed outside the Master Plan process.”</i></p>

<p>levels on noise should be published and the Community Fund into which fines are paid should be open to public scrutiny. The level of penalty should be set at a level that discourages infringements.</p>	<p><i>Nevertheless, we will consider the possible publication of penalty levels . Our general approach to these matters will be to make as much information publicly available as possible and to have regular reports to the Independent Consultative Committee. We will also consider placing this information in the public domain by putting it on the Airport’s website.”</i></p> <p>The Master Plan itself now includes some information on current noise penalty levels.</p>	<p>Section A 4.10.3 now includes additional information.</p>
<p>r) The Airport Company’s noise infringement levels and enforcement locations and their effect on noise exposure should be reviewed independently on an annual basis.</p>	<p><i>“Agree. This is already in place as part of the certified management system. All our controls and procedures are internally audited and our system is subject to third party audit every 6 months.”</i></p>	<p><i>“No change required”</i></p>
<p>s) That the prohibition of training flights at night must be maintained and training flights using large commercial air craft should be restricted to those required for familiarisation with the Nottingham East Midlands Airport site.</p>	<p><i>“We agree that further restrictions on training flights are required.”</i></p>	<p><i>“The Master Plan has incorporated further restrictions on training flights (see Appendix 5).”</i></p>
<p>t) That the noise benefits of the proposed runway extension should be explicitly quantified in the final version of the Master Plan.</p>	<p><i>“Not agreed. This is a matter for the planning process and is inappropriate for the Master Plan.”</i></p>	<p><i>“No change required.”</i></p>

<p>u) Whilst the Council welcomes in principle the proposed increase in the levels of noise insulation grants, a review of the costs incurred should be undertaken by the Airport and published to allow an assessment to be made of the adequacy of the level of assistance provided.</p>	<p>No direct response is made to this comment. However the following is offered in relation to a comment that the Sound Insulation grant scheme should be revised to make it more flexible and less bureaucratic:</p> <p><i>“Agreed. The scheme has been revised with these objectives in mind.”</i></p>	<p><i>“The revised scheme is outlined in the Master Plan in Chapter 7 and Appendices 4 and 5”</i></p>
<p>v) That the Sound Insulation Grant Scheme should be available to all dwellings within the 54dBLAeq 8hr noise contour and the affected properties should be clearly identified in the Master Plan.</p>	<p>No direct response is made to this comment. However the following is offered in relation to a comment that the Master Plan should indicate numbers of dwellings where the different levels of mitigation are anticipated:</p> <p><i>“The Master Plan provides details of the number of dwellings within each noise contour.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Information provided in the Master Plan Appendix 4”</i></p>
<p>w) That the public transport usage target for air passengers should exclude travel by taxi.</p>	<p><i>“Agreed. This is already the case and we will make clear that our targets exclude taxi use.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Clarification inserted in Appendix 6 section 6.3.14.”</i></p>
<p>x) That the Master Plan should set a sufficiently challenging target (10-15%) for public transport usage, which is monitored and reassessed on a regular basis.</p>	<p><i>“Having considered this matter we have decided not to change our targets but to regard them as minima. We will review them as part of the five year review of the Master Plan.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Appropriate insert made in Chapter 8 section 8.2 and Appendix 6 section 6.3.14.”</i></p>

<p>y) That the Airport Company should promote and take forward the concept of an Airport-based green travel plan aimed at all employees on the Airport site.</p>	<p><i>“Agreed. This is what our Surface Access Strategy seeks to do”.</i></p>	<p><i>“No change required.”</i></p>
<p>z) That dedicated bus lanes and other priority measures should be introduced where feasible on sections of bus route where traffic congestion regularly occurs thereby improving reliability in relation to private car access. The Airport should provide funding to support these measures.</p>	<p><i>“The Airport works with local Highway Authorities and the Highways Agency to improve public transport infrastructure and provides significant levels of funding.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Section on partnership working updated in Appendix 6 to indicate that EMA will continue to work with partners to take forward bus priority measures through the LTP process.”</i></p>
<p>aa) That the Airport Company’s support for the investigation of the potential for a light rail link to the proposed Parkway facility be supported. However Regional Spatial Strategy Policy 55 indicates that land should be identified and safeguarded for the purpose of identifying and establishing a heavy rail link in the long term and it is considered that the Master Plan should incorporate a firm commitment to meeting this requirement.</p>	<p><i>“Noted; our position on these matters is set out in section 11.16 of the main (Consultation Process and Responses) report. Technical evidence shows that a heavy rail link is not a practical proposition by 2030 and that a guided transport system might be needed to replace the proposed shuttle bus operation from the East Midlands Parkway Station, but only if the Airport were to grow much more rapidly than forecast in the White Paper. In terms of a light rail link we support the recommendation of the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Structure Plan to investigate a possible light rail link extending from Nottingham/Clifton/EMPS and then potentially on to EMA.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Further information provided in Appendix 6 section 6 .4.1”</i></p>

<p>bb) That the potential of the Parkway Station to serve Airport passengers would be greatly enhanced through the establishment of a continuous passenger rail loop linking the facility to Leicester, Coalville, Swadlincote, Burton and Derby and incorporating the proposed National Forest Line. The desirability of such provision should be acknowledged in the Master Plan.</p>	<p>No response is made to this comment.</p>	<p>No reference is included within the Master Plan.</p>
<p>cc) That the establishment of public transport links between Nottingham East Midlands Airport and the Swadlincote Urban Area, including demand responsive services, is welcomed both in terms of providing sustainable access to the facility for passengers and staff and opening employment opportunities for local residents who may have no viable alternative means of gaining access to the site. It is nevertheless considered that services in South Derbyshire should be further developed in terms of routes and frequency of service, taking full account of the need to protect the amenity of South Derbyshire residents and following prior consultation. The Airport should make a long term commitment to supporting such services, particularly to meet the needs of employees during less popular travelling times. It may be appropriate to secure such funding by</p>	<p>No direct response to these comments is provided. However, the following is offered in response to a comment that the Airport needs to work closely with public transport providers to get more people to give up their cars:</p> <p><i>“Noted. There is already a strong relationship between the Airport and public transport providers, including the regular Airport Transport Forum and joint working such as kickstart bids. The Airport will endeavour to continue these strong relationships.”</i></p> <p>It should also be noted that the Master Plan now includes a proposal to seek funding for a new service to Burton-on-Trent in the period to 2016</p>	<p><i>“No change required”.</i></p> <p>Reference to proposed bus service to Burton-on-Trent in section A 6.3.2</p>

<p>negotiating contributions through Section 106 agreements in association with new development at the Airport site. Consideration should also be given to extending the Swadlincote service to Burton upon Trent.</p>		
<p>dd) That the Master Plan should recognise the clear link between car parking demand and public transport provision with a view to reducing the need for additional parking space at the Airport.</p>	<p><i>“Agreed. We have attempted to do this but we have given this matter further consideration.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Further information provided in Chapter 8 and Appendix 6.”</i></p>
<p>ee) The impact of vehicles accessing the airport through villages such as Melbourne and Kings Newton continues to be a cause for concern in South Derbyshire, particularly during times of congestion on the trunk road network. This further demonstrates the need for the Master Plan to set challenging modal-shift targets and for trunk road capacity constraints to be addressed at the earliest opportunity. The environmental impact of traffic accessing the Airport using sensitive routes should be among the factors to be taken into account in negotiating the level of contributions the Airport should make towards trunk road capacity improvements.</p>	<p><i>“Improvements to the motorway network and the A453 should significantly reduce rat-running.”</i></p>	<p><i>“This is addressed within Appendix 6 section 6.3.12 and Chapter 8 section 8.2.9.”</i></p>
<p>ff) That the attention given to the issue of freight in the Surface Access Strategy is considered to be inadequate in relation to five of the seven action points relating to the Airport set out in the East</p>	<p>The points made are not highlighted individually but the response is as follows: <i>“Agreed.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Stronger reference is given to freight, particularly the</i></p>

<p>Midlands Regional Freight Strategy, published in 2005, and reproduced at Annexe J of this report. These are considered in turn as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Strategy fails to identify the surface access implications of the proposed growth in air freight.• No reference is made to any measures required to satisfactorily resolve the environmental implications of surface access needs in relation to freight.• The Strategy does not address the issue of the transfer of surface freight from road to rail and pays no regard to the potential for the establishment of direct rail freight connection.• No regard is paid to the pursuit of opportunities for the transfer of freight from air to rail.• The Strategy fails to identify opportunities for modal shift from air/road where speed is not a key factor for the customer and where other packages could be both viable and deliver environmental benefits.		<p><i>Regional Freight Strategy, in Appendix 6 and Chapter 8 section 8.2.10”</i></p>
--	--	--

<p>gg) That the commitment to improved staff training be welcomed along with the Airport Company's involvement in local "job fairs". There is scope for further activity of this kind including the development of flexible employment opportunities, working with disadvantaged groups, training in basic skills, addressing employability (e.g. through work experience schemes) and assistance in overcoming other barriers in returning to work. It is considered that the Airport should make a long-term commitment to such activity.</p>	<p>The Airport does not directly address most of these comments. However the following is offered in response to a generalised summary of comments in this regard:</p> <p><i>"The Airport encourages employers on-site to have good employment practice. In our view conditions and wages are generally competitive."</i></p> <p>Although not mentioned in the "Consultation Process and Responses" document these issues are all now referred to in the expanded "Employment section of the Master Plan.</p>	<p>The "Consultation Process and Responses" document indicates "No change required". However all the issues referred to in the Council's representation have been addressed in the newly expanded text of Section 2.3.2</p> <p>References to emplo</p>
<p>hh) That Crèche facilities should be provided and made available for all Airport staff and all employees of businesses based at the Airport site to enable parents to return to work.</p>	<p>No response to these comments has been provided, although the Master Plan itself now includes a reference to the provision of child care facilities on site.</p>	<p>Child care facilities are referred to in section 2.3.2.</p>
<p>ii) That Greater emphasis needs to be given to the attraction of tourist traffic, with links to local areas, including the National Forest, supported and promoted. It is considered that the Airport should play a more active role in this regard by contributing funding or expertise toward such initiatives as the National Forest and Beyond Partnership.</p>	<p>The following is offered in response to a general summary of comments in this regard:</p> <p><i>"Agreed. We have strengthened the references to working proactively with other agencies to stimulate inbound tourism and to reduce the tourist deficit"</i></p>	<p><i>"Strengthened references to working with other agencies in section 2.3.5"</i></p>

