

---

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM: 12</b>
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	<b>20 NOVEMBER 2008</b>	<b>CATEGORY: DELEGATED</b>
<b>REPORT FROM:</b>	<b>DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES</b>	<b>OPEN PARAGRAPH NO:</b>
<b>MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT:</b>	<b>RICHARD GROVES</b>	<b>DOC:</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT RUNWAY EXTENSION PROPOSALS</b>	<b>REF: u:\richard\committees\EDS19</b>
<b>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</b>	<b>ALL</b>	<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE: EDS</b>

---

## **1.0 Recommendations**

- 1.1 It is recommended that the officer comments set out in this report be forwarded as the Council's response to the runway extension proposal.

## **2.0 Purpose of Report**

- 2.1 To seek a member resolution on a planning application, submitted to North West Leicestershire District Council, to extend the East Midlands Airport runway.

## **3.0 Executive Summary**

- 3.1 The report sets out the purpose of the proposal to extend the East Midlands Airport runway and forecasts the impacts in terms of noise, air pollution and road traffic, proposing a Council response in relation to each of these areas of interest.

## **4.0 Detail**

- 4.1 In August 2000 East Midlands Airport (EMA) submitted a planning application and supporting Environmental Statement (ES) seeking permission to extend the runway by 30 metres to the east and 160 metres to the west. The proposal was reported to the Council's Planning and Economic Development Committee at its meeting of 22 February 2001 (minute PED/57 refers). It was resolved that concerns relating to the inadequacy of the environmental statement in regard to noise mitigation and air quality impacts, along with comments relating to surface transport considerations, be forwarded as the Council's response to the consultation. EMA submitted a Supplementary Report to the ES to take account of updated air traffic forecasts in 2004, but the application has since remained undetermined.
- 4.2 In light of the publication of the EMA Master Plan and continued growth in aircraft activity at EMA, a further update to the ES has been submitted to enable North West Leicestershire District Council to be in a position to determine the application. The revised ES sets out the changes to the planning context and considers noise, air quality and road traffic affects.

#### Purpose of the proposal

- 4.3 The purpose of the runway extension is to allow the largest aircraft to depart at heavier take off weights thus supporting the establishment and maintenance of long-haul services. When departing for target destinations in the United States the extended runway would allow MD11 aircraft to carry a payload of 87.7 tonnes, an increase of 6.5 tonnes, and the Boeing 747-400 to carry a payload of 119.2 tonnes, an increase of 7.0 tonnes. EMA forecasts indicate that at 2016, 1560 aircraft annually, or 2.8% of departing aircraft, could depart at greater take-off weight. The proposal is not in itself forecast to result in any additional flights.
- 4.4 The table below shows forecasts for passenger numbers, air cargo tonnage and air traffic movements as set out in the 2000 ES, the 2004 ES Supplement and the 2006 Master Plan, the latter representing the basis of the 2008 ES Update. It can be seen that since the 2000 ES there has been growth in all categories, although the number of air traffic movements was reduced in the forecast compiled for the 2006 Master Plan/2008 ES Update in relation to that shown in the 2004 ES Supplement. This was due to differences in assumed passenger per flight levels arising from the advent of low cost carriers. In other words, each plane will carry more passengers, meaning that the total number of passengers can be carried more efficiently with fewer total air transport movements.

#### **Air Traffic Forecasts 2016**

	2000 ES		2004 ES Supplement		2006 Master Plan/ 2008 ES Update	
	Without Extention	With Extention	Without Extention	With Extention	Without Extention	With Extention
<b>Passenger Forecast (million passengers pa)</b>	6.79	7.19	9.22	9.22	9.22	9.22
<b>Air Cargo Forecast (000's)</b>	650.3	750.3	1202.6	1207.0	1202.6	1207.0
<b>Total Air Transport Movements (000's)</b>	90.4	94.8	122.5	122.5	110.9	110.9

#### Officer Comment

- 4.5 The Council has previously acknowledged that the presence of EMA yields substantial economic benefits both for the region and for South Derbyshire and has recognised the need to accommodate controlled growth in air transport, as set out in a report to Finance and Management Committee, dated 16 May 2006 (minute FM/144 refers). However, it is not possible at this stage to comment on the acceptability of the proposal as it is considered that the issue of noise has been inadequately addressed in the ES Update (see para.s 4.9 – 4.14).

#### Noise

- 4.6 Research undertaken for the Government has concluded that single noise events, i.e. the sound generated by an individual aircraft as it passes, of less than 90 dB(A) SEL are unlikely to result in any measurable change to the rates of sleep disturbance experienced. The 2008 ES Update therefore presents 90dB SEL plans to enable

comparison of the noise impact of the individual aircraft types affected by the runway proposal, the MD11 and B747-400F, with and without the extension. These are included in this report at Appendices A and B respectively and relate to take-offs only, as landings will not be affected.

- 4.7 The 2008 ES Update also proposes that the landing threshold for aircraft approaching from the east be moved 150 metres to the west, resulting in a modest increase in the altitude of aircraft arriving from that direction, marginally reducing the noise impact of arrivals to the east of EMA.
- 4.8 Although not referred to in the 2008 ES Update, EMA has stated that the runway extension will have no discernible impact on average daytime and night time noise levels (dBL<sub>aeq</sub>, 16h and dBL<sub>aeq</sub> 8h respectively). This is due to the relatively small proportion of total Air Traffic Movements at EMA forecast to be affected.

#### Officer Comment

- 4.9 It can be seen that the “with extension” 90dB SEL footprints do not encompass heavily developed areas, although the boundaries of the MD11 footprints move closer towards the developed areas of Kings Newton and Melbourne and those of the B747-400F move closer towards the developed areas of Barrow upon Trent and Smisby. An independent noise consultant, Rupert Taylor, has been appointed by North West Leicestershire District Council to assist in the consideration of the ES update and has confirmed that the contour maps appear to have been correctly produced.
- 4.10 One of the aims of an Environmental Impact Assessment is to describe the residual effects of environmental impacts after mitigation. In commenting on 2000 ES the Planning and Economic Development Committee noted that this stage of the evaluation process was absent and this was seen as a fundamental flaw in the study that needed to be addressed. Neither the 2004 ES Supplementary Report nor the 2008 ES update have addressed this omission.
- 4.11 Whilst Rupert Taylor agrees with the conclusion in the 2008 ES Update that the increase in noise attributable to the use of the development is not likely to be significant, he points out that because the airport has minimal night noise controls, the baseline night noise impact is much higher than at other comparable airports. He therefore contends that it is arguable that any increase in an already high impact would bring with it a need for control to avoid exacerbating the situation, by however small a margin. His conclusion is that the ES ought to include an update on EMA’s controls over night noise, being the locally agreed policy that enabled the Secretary of State for Transport to determine that the airport should not be designated under the Civil Aviation Act 1982. Members may recall that designation would have brought the regulation and operation of EMA under Government control, and that the Secretary of State’s most recent response to this Council’s request for such was considered by Full Council on 9 November 2006 (minute CL/83 refers).
- 4.12 The controls on night noise referred to by the Secretary of State have now been superseded by the controls set out in the Airport Master Plan of 2006. It should be noted that the Master Plan is a non-statutory document and that, for the most part, noise control and mitigation measures set out within it are non-binding and unenforceable. In commenting on the Draft version of the document, the Council expressed dissatisfaction with several of the proposed noise control and mitigation measures. Following publication of the final version of the document, a number of Council concerns remain outstanding as set out in a report to Environmental and Development Services Committee of 8 March 2007 (minute EDS/87 refers).

Although the ES Update identifies the Master Plan as part of the planning context, the noise control and mitigation measures set out in the Plan are not explicitly identified in the ES Supplement as the means by which the impacts of the runway extension proposal will be mitigated.

4.13 Although the 2008 ES Update indicates that a relatively small proportion of departing aircraft would be affected by these proposals by 2016, it should be noted that this simply represents a forecast and that the local authorities will continue to lack any means by which to control the size or weight of aircraft departing EMA.

4.14 Taking the above considerations into account, it is recommended that objection be made on the grounds that:

(i) the proposal will lead to an increase in noise levels within South Derbyshire.

(ii) the ES does not meet the requirements of government regulations in that no reference is made to noise mitigation measures. Existing noise control and mitigation measures, as set out in the Master Plan, are non-binding and are considered to be insufficient to adequately protect public amenity within the district.

#### Air Quality

4.15 The main pollutants of interest in the vicinity of EMA are nitrogen dioxide, benzene and particulate matter. The proposed works are not forecast to have any significant impact on air quality within South Derbyshire.

#### Officer Comment

4.16 In commenting on the originally submitted ES in 2000, the Planning and Economic Development Committee resolved to express the view that an Air Quality Action Plan should be agreed with North West Leicestershire District Council. This would set out the detail of monitoring to be undertaken and measures to effect a reduction in emissions to the atmosphere from EMA operations. The Committee also considered that “an independent assessment of hydrocarbon emissions should be undertaken, linked to a health study within the communities underneath the flight paths, identifying the hydrocarbon compounds present and their potential health effects. These measures should be taken into consideration as part of a revised ES”.

4.17 In accordance with the Government’s Air Quality Strategy, North West Leicestershire District Council has since undertaken an Air Quality Review and Assessment and has concluded that operations at EMA are unlikely to result in air quality exceeding any of the limits prescribed by the Government. Air quality monitoring, covering Nitrogen Dioxide, particulate matter, and benzene (a hydrocarbon), carried out by North West Leicestershire District Council and EMA, now takes place on a continuous basis and the results are published on the EMA website. This Council’s Environmental Health Service is satisfied that air quality is sufficiently addressed via this monitoring strategy. It is therefore recommended that no objection be raised in this respect.

#### Road Traffic

4.18 The 2000 ES reported that the runway extension would result in a 5% increase in road traffic generated by the airport. This was revised downwards in the 2004 ES Supplement which considered that the runway extension would have a limited impact on the surrounding road network and that the extension would result in an increase in road traffic of less than 1%. This was considered to be insignificant in terms of traffic impact. The 2008 ES Update states that since the Air Transport Movements forecast is consistent with those used in the 2004 ES Supplement, the Airport Master Plan

and the Air Transport White Paper, it is proposed that there be no change to the road traffic update.

#### Officer Comment

- 4.19 The ES Update shows no difference in the total number of Air Transport Movements with or without the proposed runway extension and a small increase in the weight of cargo handled with the extension, as shown in the table at para. 4.4. The resulting road traffic impact is therefore expected to be minimal and the highways authorities have raised no concerns. It is therefore recommended that no objection be raised in this respect.

### **5.0 Corporate Implications**

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

- "Safer, Healthier Communities" insofar as noise disturbance and air pollution can present health implications
- "Rural South Derbyshire" in that the area of South Derbyshire most directly affected by the environmental impacts of activity at EMA is rural in nature
- "Prosperity For All" in that the presence and growth of EMA presents economic implications for South Derbyshire

### **6.0 Community Implications**

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

- "Healthy Communities" insofar as noise disturbance and air pollution can present health implications
- "A Vibrant Economy" in that the presence and growth of EMA presents economic implications for South Derbyshire
- "A Sustainable Environment" in that activity at EMA presents potential environmental implications for South Derbyshire

### **7.0 Conclusions**

- 7.1 See "Officer Comment" in paras. 4.5, 4.9 - 4.14; 4.16 - 4.17 and 4.19.

### **8.0 Background Papers**

Letter from North West Leicestershire District Council

8 July 2008

Proposed Runway Extension Update to Environmental Statement

East Midlands Airport  
May 2008

East Midlands Airport Master Plan

East Midlands Airport  
December 2006