

**NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**CABINET – 24 JUNE 2014**

Title of report	<b>EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PLAN (MASTER PLAN) CONSULTATION</b>
Key Decision	a) Financial No b) Community Yes
Contacts	Councillor Trevor Pendleton 01509 569746 <a href="mailto:trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>  Director of Services 01530 454555 <a href="mailto:steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>  Head of Regeneration and Planning 01530 454782 <a href="mailto:david.hughes@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">david.hughes@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>
Purpose of report	To formulate the Council's response to the draft Master Plan
Reason for Decision	To agree the Council's position
Council Priorities	Homes and Communities Business and Jobs Green Footprints Challenge
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	None at this stage, although there may be resource implications at the Local Plan stage
Link to relevant CAT	None
Risk Management	Failure by the Council to respond to the current consultation would potentially result in local concerns not being considered
Equalities Impact Assessment	None
Human Rights	None
Transformational Government	Not applicable

Comments of Head of Paid Service	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory
Consultees	None
Background papers	<p>East Midlands Airport Sustainable Development Plan (Master Plan) which can be viewed at <a href="http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/developmentplan">www.eastmidlandsairport.com/developmentplan</a></p> <p>The Aviation Framework which can be viewed at <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/153776/aviation-policy-framework.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/153776/aviation-policy-framework.pdf</a></p> <p>The North West Leicestershire Local Plan (2002) which can be viewed at <a href="http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/local_plan">www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/local_plan</a></p> <p>East Midlands Airport – Noise Action Plan (2010) which can be viewed at <a href="http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/emaweb.nsf/Content/Reportingandresourcesources">http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/emaweb.nsf/Content/Reportingandresourcesources</a></p> <p>Diseworth and Long Whatton Catchment Study – Final Report (January 2014) which can be viewed at <a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/sustainability/flood_management/floodingpublisheddocuments.htm">www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/sustainability/flood_management/floodingpublisheddocuments.htm</a></p>
Recommendation	<p><b>THAT THE COUNCIL ADVISES EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT THAT:</b></p> <p>(I) THE COMMITMENT TO REVIEW THE MASTER PLAN EVERY 5 YEARS IS WELCOMED;</p> <p>(II) THE VISION SHOULD BE AMENDED TO REFLECT THE NEED TO BALANCE ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS AGAINST OTHER IMPACTS, PARTICULARLY ENVIRONMENTAL.</p> <p>(III) IT SUPPORTS THE TARGETS FOR BOTH SINGLE OCCUPANCY CAR USAGE AND PASSENGER ACCESS BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT;</p> <p>(IV) PROGRESS TOWARDS THESE TARGETS SHOULD BE MONITORED AS PART OF THE AIRPORT'S ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT;</p> <p>(V) IT CONSIDERS THAT THE LIST OF PRIORITY</p>

**NEW BUS SERVICES SHOULD BE RECONSIDERED;**

- (VI) REQUESTS THAT FURTHER CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN BY THE AIRPORT TO PROVIDING A FIRMER COMMITMENT TO THE PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL BUS SERVICES TO SERVE THE AIRPORT;**
- (VII) THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN NEEDS TO BE MADE CLEARER;**
- (VIII) ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE IS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE FORECASTS OF 10 MILLION PASSENGERS AND 700,000 TONNES OF CARGO BY 2040 OTHERWISE THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT FORECAST SHOULD BE USED TO PROVIDE THE BASIS FOR THE MASTER PLAN;**
- (IX) IN THE EVENT THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT FORECASTS ARE USED THEN THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FACILITIES BE REASSESSED ACCORDINGLY;**
- (X) IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF INTERIM FORECASTS FOR THE PERIOD UP TO 2040 WERE INCLUDED IN THE MASTER PLAN**
- (XI) FUTURE ANNUAL MONITORING REPORTS SHOULD ASSESS PROGRESS AGAINST BOTH THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT FORECASTS AND THE AIRPORTS FORECASTS;**
- (XII) THE OPTION TO EXTEND THE RUNWAY PERMISSION IS NOT AVAILABLE AND SO THE CONSENT SHOULD EITHER BE IMPLEMENTED OR ALLOWED TO LAPSE WITH SUBMISSION OF A NEW APPLICATION TO EXTEND THE RUNWAY WHEN REQUIRED;**
- (XIII) IT WELCOMES THE CLARITY IN THE MASTER PLAN THAT A SECOND RUNWAY IS NOT LIKELY TO BE NEEDED BY 2040;**
- (XIV) IT NOTES THE PROPOSALS IN RESPECT OF THE PEGASUS BUSINESS PARK, THE PROVISION OF A NEW CARGO AREA AT THE EASTERN END OF THE RUNWAY AND ADDITIONAL CAR PARKING SOUTH OF ARGOSY ROAD AND WILL GIVE CONSIDERATION TO THESE AS PART OF PREPARING THE COUNCIL'S NEW LOCAL PLAN;**
- (XV) IT NOTES THE SUGGESTION FOR POSSIBLE ADDITIONAL EMPLOYMENT LAND SOUTH OF THE A453 AND WILL GIVE CONSIDERATION TO THIS AS PART OF PREPARING THE COUNCIL'S NEW LOCAL PLAN;**

	<p>(XVI) THE DESIGN OF ANY SCHEME FOR WATER STORAGE CAPACITY GIVES FULL CONSIDERATION TO THE POTENTIAL IMPACT UPON PROPERTIES AND SETTLEMENTS DOWNSTREAM OF THE AIRPORT</p> <p>(XVII) IT NOTES AND WELCOMES THE COMMITMENT IN THE MASTER PLAN TO ‘LIMIT AND REDUCE WHERE POSSIBLE THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED BY NOISE’;</p> <p>(XVIII) FURTHER INFORMATION SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO SUPPORT THE IDENTIFICATION OF A NOISE ENVELOPE BASED ON NOISE CONTOURS RATHER THAN ANY OF THE OTHER ALTERNATIVES REFERRED TO IN THE AVIATION FRAMEWORK;</p> <p>(XIX) IT CONSIDERS THAT A SEPARATE CONSULTATION SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN IN RESPECT OF THE NOISE ACTION PLAN SO THAT STAKEHOLDERS CAN BETTER UNDERSTAND THE LIKELY IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE MASTER PLAN IN RESPECT OF NOISE.</p> <p>(XX) IT WELCOMES THE INCLUSION OF A SPECIFIC SECTION SETTING OUT HOW THE AIRPORT WILL WORK WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES ;AND</p> <p>(XXI) IT WELCOMES THE RANGE OF COMMUNITY INITIATIVES IDENTIFIED.</p>
--	--

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In 2006 East Midlands Airport (EMA) prepared a Master Plan to set out how the Airport Company envisaged that the airport would develop up to 2030. A new Master Plan (titled a Sustainable Development Plan) which covers the period up to 2040 has now been published for consultation. This report considers the Master Plan and how the Council should respond to the consultation.
- 1.2 The Master Plan was published for consultation in March for a period up to 23 May 2014. In view of the fact that there was not a suitable Cabinet meeting date prior to this closing date the airport has agreed that the Council can submit its comments after the closing date.

## 2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

### National

- 2.1 The need to produce a Master Plan for the airport was initially introduced as part of the then Government’s ‘Future of Air Transport White Paper’ in 2003. In March 2013 the Coalition Government published an ‘Aviation Policy Framework’. This reaffirms the Government’s view that airports should continue to prepare Master Plans and that these should be updated every 5 years, preferably to coincide with the periods covered by Noise

Action Plans and Surface Access Strategies. It also reconfirms that Master Plans do not have any statutory basis, but that their primary objective “ *is to provide a clear statement of intent on the part of an airport operator to enable future development of the airport to be given due consideration in local planning processes*”.

2.2 The Aviation Framework includes an annex (Annex B) which sets out guidance on Master Plans. It suggests that the following areas as a minimum will need to be addressed in any Master Plan:

- forecasts;
- infrastructure proposals;
- safeguarding and land/property take;
- impact on people and the natural environment; and
- proposals to minimise and mitigate impacts.

### Local Plan

2.3 The North West Leicestershire Local Plan was adopted in 2002. It includes a number of specific policies in respect of EMA (Policies T18, T19 and T20). These policies:

- Define the Airport limit;
- Define an area for built development within this overall limit;
- Provide for development for operational purposes, subject to assessment of impacts and application of appropriate mitigation measures;
- Identify and protect the designated Public Safety Zones;
- Specify consultation zones; and
- Protect employment land at Pegasus Business Park.

2.4 As Members will be aware a new Local Plan is in the early stages of being prepared. All existing policies will need to be reviewed and so the existing Local Plan policies could change in the near future.

2.5 The Aviation Framework states that “*the primary objective of master plans is to provide a clear statement of intent on the part of an airport operator to enable future development of the airport to be given due consideration in local planning processes*”. Therefore, in preparing the new Local Plan it will be necessary to have regard to the provisions of the Master Plan, although this does not automatically mean that its provisions should be included.

## **3.0 THE MASTER PLAN**

3.1 The Master Plan itself comprises of four separate sections:

- Economy and surface access;
- Land use
- Environment and
- Community

3.2 Each of these sections is considered separately below in the order in which they appear in the Master Plan. Each section is summarised and then a number of key aspects are

considered in more detail. These considerations are mirrored in the recommendations which are set out above in full for clarity.

- 3.3 In terms of the Noise Action Plan (NAP) (referred to in The Aviation Framework) this is a requirement under Section 18 of the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006 (as amended). These regulations transposed the EU Environmental Noise Directive (2002/49/EC), known as END, into UK legislation. The current NAP dates from 2010. It is understood that the NAP is in the process of being reviewed in parallel with the preparation of the Master Plan and responses to the current consultation will be used to inform the revised NAP. However, no draft NAP is available for consultation.

### **General**

- 3.4 The Master Plan is referred to as a Sustainable Development Plan and has as its vision the following:  
*To develop the airport as a business that contributes to the competitiveness of the region, promotes inward investment, provides high quality jobs and meets the travel needs of local people.*
- 3.5 There is a commitment to review the Master Plan every 5 years in line with the Aviation Framework.

### **Comment**

- 3.6 The commitment to review the Master Plan every 5 years is welcomed.
- 3.7 In terms of the vision it is disappointing that no reference is included to the need to manage the environmental impact of activities at the airport but that instead it focuses exclusively upon the economic benefits of the airport. If the Master Plan is to be a truly sustainable plan then this needs to be reflected in the vision. The forward to the Executive Summary does state that *“We will manage our environmental impact and we know we must continue to work closely openly and honestly with our stakeholders and the communities that live around us”*.
- 3.8 It is considered that the vision should be amended to reflect this commitment.

### **Economy and Surface Access**

- 3.9 This section considers the economic impact of the airport and sets out a surface access plan to show how accessibility to the airport will be managed so as to minimise impact upon the road network, to manage and reduce emissions from transport associated with the airport whilst ensuring that the airport remains accessible for passengers, employers and employees. The later section on Land Use also includes some matters which relate to surface access which is somewhat confusing. It would be helpful if this could be addressed in the final version of the Master Plan.

### Summary

- It is estimated that there are some 6,700 jobs on the airport site, of which 45% are passenger related and 36% cargo related.

- 1 in 47 of the working population of North West Leicestershire work at EMA.
- It is estimated that the airport generates some £239million of annual Gross Value Added (i.e. the contribution to the economy of each individual producer, industry or sector in the United Kingdom) in the region.
- The important role played by express delivery services at the airport coupled with the importance of night time flights availability at the airport are highlighted.
- Target to achieve a Single Occupancy Car usage of 65% and 15% passenger access by public transport based on 10 million passengers, subject to continued improvements in public transport provision.
- A 'wish list' of key bus route improvements which would benefit the airport (including improved connections to Coalville and Ashby) subject to growth and commercial viability of such services.
- Rail connection to airport not viable as shown by 2008 study.
- Commitment provided to working with the Highways Agency and other highway authorities to address congestion issues and to ensure excellent access to the airport remains available and to working with rail operators and Network Rail to encourage usage by airport users of the East Midlands Parkway.

## **Comments**

### Economic importance of the airport

- 3.10 The importance of the airport to the regional and local economy is clearly very significant. However, as already noted (paragraph 3.7) these positive benefits have to be balanced against other considerations, including impact upon the environment (locally and further afield) and local communities.

### Surface access

- 3.11 The targets in the 2006 Master Plan were to reduce employee single occupancy car use to 70% by 2016 and to increase passenger access by public transport to 10% by 2016. Notwithstanding the fact that both passenger and cargo forecasts in the 2006 Master Plan have not been realised (as outlined later in the section on Land Use), the new Master Plan notes that in 2012 employee single car occupancy was down to 71% and passenger access by public transport was at 9%, virtually at the levels being sought in the 2006 Master Plan.
- 3.12 These results show significant progress towards meeting the 2006 Master Plan and are to be welcomed. The airport company has taken a lead on trying to increase public transport accessibility to the airport, initially by subsidising new bus services from Derby, Leicester and Nottingham (in total some £2.9 million has been directly funded by the airport). These are now fully fledged commercial services known as Skylink.
- 3.13 In terms of the new targets for single occupancy car usage and passenger access by public transport, these are both seeking a 6% improvement by 2040 from their position in 2012.
- 3.14 It could be argued that a 6% improvement is not that significant. However, it is recognised that there are particular difficulties at East Midlands Airport, including its geographical location relative to the three cities of Leicester, Nottingham and Derby, the predominance

of leisure-based travel with its dispersed catchment area, and the lack of direct rail access. Furthermore, in terms of employee access it has to be recognised that there is a large number of companies that operate at the airport, many of whom operate shift patterns which make car sharing and/or use of non-car modes difficult to achieve, particularly early in the morning or late at night.

- 3.15 In these circumstances it is considered that the targets proposed in the Master Plan are challenging. As noted in the Master Plan this matter will need to be monitored and reassessed as part of the next review in 5 years time. If it appears at that time that the targets are going to be met then more challenging targets can be established. Conversely if they are not being met consideration can be given as to what additional steps may be required.
- 3.16 In terms of the potential for new bus services it is disappointing to note that out of a list of the 6 priority improvements identified improved connections to Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch are ranked third and fifth respectively. The top priority is increased frequency of existing services to Leicester, Derby, Nottingham and Long Eaton. This is at odds with the statement in the Master Plan that *“At the top of the list of priorities are towns like Coalville (who currently only have a day-time service) and Ilkeston”*.
- 3.17 Both Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch, as the two largest settlements in the district, would benefit from improved connectivity to the airport and so would provide more employment opportunities for local residents. The airport should be asked to reconsider its approach on this matter.
- 3.18 No specific financial commitment is provided from the airport towards the support for new services. Instead the airport is seeking to work with the promoters of new developments in the vicinity of the airport (for example the East Midlands Distribution Centre, the potential Strategic Rail Fright Interchange) which have the potential for new services on the back of these developments.
- 3.19 Whilst working in partnership is understandable it does raises questions as to whether the targets are likely to be met and hence whether a more proactive approach would be better. The airport should be asked to reconsider its approach on this matter.

## **Land Use**

- 3.20 This section covers forecasts of future predicted growth, airport capacity and the implications of the predicted growth in respect of the need for new or expanded facilities and new development needs.

### Summary

- Passenger throughput of 10 million passengers per annum in the period 2030 – 2040 and a cargo throughput of 700,000 tonnes by 2040. The forecasts are to be reviewed periodically.
- Based on these forecasts the number of Air Transport Movements (ATM) (i.e. aircraft landings or take offs) would increase as follows:

	<b>2013</b>	<b>2040</b>
<b>Passenger movements</b>	35,939	70,000



<b>Cargo movements</b>	23,805	42,600
<b>Total</b>	59,744	112,600

- It is suggested that the future split between day and night time movements will be similar to today. Based on the figure of 112,600 air transport movements this could see 36,595 night time flights compared to 19,452 in 2013.
- In terms of runway capacity, the Master Plan identifies that the current runway is capable of accommodating 34-36 runway movements per hour which is estimated as being sufficient capacity to accommodate the predicted number of passengers and cargo as at 2040. Therefore, there is not anticipated to be a need for a second runway before 2040. However, EMA will look to work with the District Council to extend the life of the current consent to extend the runway by 190 metres (Application number 00/00867/FUL) when economic conditions are more favourable.
- It is proposed to create additional Rapid Access/Exit Taxiways to help increase runway capacity, whilst a contingency plan will be developed to protect the operation of the airport when runway maintenance is required.
- To accommodate the predicted growth to 2040 it will be necessary to provide additional apron capacity in each of the three zones across the airport (Central Passenger Apron, Cargo West and Cargo East)
- To accommodate the predicted growth in passenger numbers it will be necessary to increase the amount of terminal floorspace from 32,000 to 75,000 square metres. This would take place on land to the south and to the west of the existing terminal and also to the east of Arrivals. It is likely that this would be done over two levels so as to segregate arrivals and departures and to reduce the overall footprint of the terminal.
- This additional terminal floor space would be developed on land currently used for passenger car parking which will be relocated elsewhere on the airport site.
- Relocation of the Fire Station to the north of the runway;
- Development of cargo facilities through the extension of the DHL Hub and the creation of a new facility between Pegasus Business Park and the runway at the east end of the site with cargo and flight support on the western most part of the Pegasus Business Park;
- Continued development of the Pegasus Business Park site with an emphasis upon those uses which require an airport location;
- The need for additional operational land beyond the existing boundaries to be kept under review, but the possibility of additional employment on land south of A453 next to Moto service area to be pursued through the Local Plan process.;
- Additional storm-water storage capacity either by extending existing balancing ponds and through additional facilities on EMA owned land south of the A453 and
- Doubling the amount of car parking which could include a multi storey car park in the central area near the terminal.

## **Comments**

### General

- 3.21 A 'Future Land Use Plan' is included in the Master Plan which aims to show the proposed disposition of different uses across the airport. The quality of the plan is quite poor and

difficult to read. It is considered that the inclusion of a better quality of plan is required to more clearly illustrate the airports proposals in respect of future land uses.

### Forecasts

3.22 For information the forecasts in the 2006 Master Plan were:

- Passengers - 6.93 million by 2010 and 9.2 million by 2016
- Cargo - 723,000 tonnes by 2010 and 1.2 million tonnes

3.23 The actual volume of passenger traffic grew to 5.8 million in 2008 whilst cargo traffic reached 313,000 in 2011. Notwithstanding the fact that the previous forecasts have not been realised the annual rate of growth was 5.1% for passengers between 2000 and 2012. The worldwide recession is highlighted as a reason for these projections not being met.

3.24 The Master Plan forecast of 10 million passengers by 2040 is higher than predictions published by the Department for Transport (2013) (8.20 million passengers by 2040). This is because EMA believes that the Department Of Transport model is flawed and that greater growth from its core local catchment (Leicestershire, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire) is possible, primarily due to the fact that low cost airlines provide services to destinations not offered by competitor airports. A growth to 10 million passengers would represent an annual growth rate of 3.4% over the period 2013 to 2040 which is less than that achieved for 2002 to 2012.

3.25 No significant evidence has been produced as part of the Master Plan to demonstrate that a figure of 10 million passengers by 2040 is realistic. It is considered that if the figure of 10 million passengers is to form the basis for the Master Plan that such evidence should be provided, otherwise the Department of Transport forecasts should be used instead. It would also be helpful if the assessment of the need for new and/or expanded facilities (as summarised above) were assessed in the context of the Department of Transport forecasts as well as the EMA forecasts.

3.26 Forecasting of future passenger and cargo numbers is fraught with inherent difficulties. Therefore, the forecasts should be treated with some caution and so the fact that the forecasts are to be reviewed periodically is to be welcomed. It is considered that future annual monitoring reports published by the airport should report on progress against both the Department of Transport projections and those of the Master Plan. In this respect it would be helpful if the Master Plan included interim figures (e.g. 2020, 2030) to make it easier to assess progress.

3.27 The issue of noise associated with night time flights is considered elsewhere in this report. However, it is apparent that on the basis of the forecasts included in the Master Plan that there will be a significant increase in the number of night time flights which has the potential for a subsequent increase in night time noise.

### Need for additional runway capacity

3.28 The consent to extend the runway was granted on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2011 and expires on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2016. The permission also covered other works but was principally concerned with an extension of the runway at the western end.

- 3.29 The suggestion that EMA will seek to extend the life of the current consent is noted. However, changes introduced in 2008 prohibit the extension of time on planning permissions. This was partially amended in 2010 when the Government introduced measures to enable the extension of planning permissions granted on or before 1 October 2009 (subsequently extended to 1 October 2010) to provide more flexibility for developers to address issues arising from the economic downturn. As noted the runway permission was granted in February 2011 which is outside of these timescales. Therefore, the option to extend the timescale for implementing the runway permission is not available. It will be necessary to either commence the existing permission or to let it lapse and submit a new application when an extension is required.
- 3.30 The suggestion that second runway will not be needed prior to 2040 is noted and welcomed. As the Department of Transport forecasts assume a lower number of passengers by 2040 this will remain the case which ever forecasts are used.

#### Passenger Terminal

- 3.31 The need to extend the passenger terminal and apron areas is directly linked to the forecasts for both passengers and cargo. The Master Plan notes that the existing terminal is only able to accommodate 6 million passengers so an extension would be required under both the Department of Transport forecasts and the EMA forecast. However, it is not clear as to what the extent of need would be in the context of the Department of Transport. Should the airport decided to use the Department of Transport forecasts as suggested above at paragraph 3.25 this will need to be addressed.
- 3.32 The approach outlined in the Master Plan would, in terms of land use, represent a continuation of the existing approach in the current Master Plan. The adopted Local Plan (Policy T18) seeks to restrict any new buildings to the existing terminal complex (as well as land at an area referred to as Gimbro Farm which is now occupied by DHL). Therefore, the suggested approach is consistent with the principles of the adopted Local Plan.
- 3.33 It should be noted that any proposal to extend the terminal will require planning permission, it is not permitted development. Any such application would need to be treated on its merits.

#### Cargo Facilities and Pegasus Business Park

- 3.34 The provision of additional cargo facilities at the DHL complex would be consistent with the provisions of the adopted Local Plan as outlined above in paragraph 3.32.
- 3.35 It is proposed to reduce the extent of the Pegasus Business Park by allowing the north eastern corner which adjoins the A435 to be used for the provision of cargo facilities. In addition, it is proposed to create additional car parking on a narrow strip between the A453 and existing cargo sheds at Argosy Road. An area of land east of the Regus office and up to the A453 would remain within the area of the business park (see Appendix 1).
- 3.36 The principal of some development on these areas has already been accepted by virtue of Policy J4 in the adopted Local Plan. However, this is in the form of a business park with a high quality environment. The cargo facilities would also encroach on to an area north of Pegasus Business Park contrary to the provision of Policy T18.

- 3.37 Therefore, the provision of new cargo facilities at the eastern end of the runway between the existing Pegasus Business Park and the runway and the provision of car parking south of Argosy Road would not be consistent with the existing Local Plan policy.
- 3.38 However, as noted in paragraph 2.5 of this report the provisions of the Master Plan will need to be considered as part of the new Local Plan. It is suggested, therefore, that at this stage the Council reserve its position on this matter and that EMA be advised that the Council will give due regard to this matter in preparing the new Local Plan.

#### Land south of the A453

- 3.39 The suggestion in the Master plan that land south of the A453 be viewed as possible additional land is noted. For members information the area concerned is identified at Appendix 2 of this report.
- 3.40 The A453 currently provides a clear limit to the Airport in relation to the attractive countryside and the village of Diseworth to the south and development here would conflict with the provisions of the adopted Local Plan.
- 3.41 However, as with the issue of additional cargo facilities at Pegasus Business Park this would need to be considered as part of the new Local Plan.

#### Additional water storage capacity

- 3.42 There have been a number of instances of flooding along the Diseworth and Long Whatton brooks. Leicestershire County Council commissioned a study in 2013 to establish the cause of these events. In particular, the study looked at contribution that runoff from the airport may have on flood risk within the catchment.
- 3.43 The study concluded that “*The airport does not appear to have been a factor in the flooding of Diseworth in the 2012 flood event*”. Notwithstanding this, the study went on to recommend that “*EMA should look to minimise discharges to watercourses during significant storm events on the catchment by diverting flows into the winter reservoirs to act as storage basins. When utilising the storage capacity of the basins in this way, the option of pumping additional flows to the River Trent should be considered as part of the measure*”.
- 3.44 In the event that additional water storage capacity is required it will be essential that EMA ensures that the design of any scheme gives full consideration to the potential impact upon properties and settlements downstream of the airport.

#### Other developments

- 3.45 The potential need for additional developments such as apron space, additional car parking and a new fire station are noted. These are largely linked to the volume of passengers and cargo that uses the airport and will depend upon the progress made towards meeting the forecasts. It is likely that such developments will fall within the definition of permitted development and so will not be a matter to be determined by the district council as local planning authority.

## Environment

- 3.46 This section details the key performance indicators which the airport will use to monitor its environmental performance, how it will seek to reduce its greenhouse emissions and how it will deal with issues such as air quality and noise, management of water and waste and its approach to landscape and ecology.

### Summary

- EMA remains committed to improve its environmental performance (currently have ISO 14001) and identifies a number of key performance indicators (Appendix 3).
- All environmental policies will be reviewed annually via the airport's senior management team.
- Seek to reduce energy demand by 10% over the next 5 years.
- EMA remains committed to meeting all of its energy needs from renewable sources or where this is not possible the resulting emissions will be off-set.
- Commitment to continuing to improve air quality including the continued operation of the existing air quality monitoring station.
- A long-term aim relating to noise is to '*limit, and reduce where possible, the number of people affected by noise as a result of the airport's operation and development*'. It is proposed to identify a Noise Envelope (an area within which noise levels will not be any higher than a set level) and this will be based on the 55 decibel night time noise contour.
- A wide range of measures to be undertaken to minimise the impact of noise on local communities, including seeking to ensure that 100% of all night time flights meet the requirements for Chapter 4 aircraft, to review the width of Noise Preferential Routes and to better understand the impact reduced engine taxiing and how the development of predefined training circuits could reduce impacts.
- The noise monitoring system will be upgraded by 2015.
- Water saving measures to be incorporated in to new buildings where appropriate, drainage systems to be effectively managed to ensure compliance with environmental permits, improvements to water quality monitoring systems, adequate attenuation run of to be provided to all new developments and will undertake a review of drainage capacity.
- Minimise adverse impacts on nature conservation, landscape, archaeological resources and cultural heritage and, where possible, create new features and enhance the ecological and landscape value of the area.

### **Comments**

- 3.47 The commitment of the airport to improve its environmental performance is welcomed although it should be appreciated that this only relates to those aspect under the airports control.
- 3.48 Significant strides have been made since the 2006 Master Plan on reducing greenhouse gas emissions (ground operations became carbon neutral in 2012). Examples of initiatives undertaken include the installation of ground source heat pumps which reduce carbon emissions from heating and cooling the extended passenger terminal 'Pier', a 26 hectare willow coppice has been planted which will provide renewable fuel for a biomass boiler

and two full sized wind turbines have been installed generating 5% of the electricity used by the airport.

- 3.49 Notwithstanding these improvements and the various commitments outlined above, it remains the case that the airport still has some significant environmental impacts, including noise and air quality. It is also the case that whilst the airports own ground operations are carbon neutral a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions still occur as a result of the aircraft which use the airport.

### Noise

- 3.50 Of all the environmental impacts associated with the airport that of noise is and always will be, as is recognised in the Master Plan, an issue for some people, particularly those who live nearest to the airport.
- 3.51 A particular concern in respect of East Midlands Airport is that there are no restrictions in place in respect of the number of night time flights that can operate from the airport. Data in Appendix 3B of the airport's 2010 Noise Action Plan identifies that the number of people within the 50-54 decibel night time noise category was 4,100 with higher numbers only recorded at Heathrow, Manchester and Birmingham. Furthermore, as noted above, there are no controls over the number of night time flights which if the forecasts for growth are correct will increase from 19,500 in 2013 to 36,600 in 2040, an increase of 87%.
- 3.52 The District Council as local planning authority can seek to impose some controls when determining planning applications. However, any controls which it is proposed to include must be directly and reasonably related in kind and scale to the development proposed. This means that such controls can seek to deal with additional problems that result from a development but not to resolve existing issues.
- 3.53 The District Council has previously sought support from Government for designation of the airport in accordance with Section 78 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982. Such a designation would enable controls to be put in place that limit the number of night time flights. However, the Government declined to designate the airport.
- 3.54 Therefore, at this time it appears that there is little prospect of the airport being designated and so the Council will have to continue to use its powers where appropriate and continue to press for reducing the impact from night time flights wherever it can, for example via the Airport Consultative Committee.
- 3.55 The long term aim in respect of noise is similar to the approach taken by the Aviation Framework. The only difference is that the Aviation Framework refers to limiting and reducing the number of people '*significantly affected by aircraft noise*', whereas the Master Plan refers to people '*affected by noise as a result of the airports operations*' (i.e. it includes more than just noise from aircraft). It could be argued that the Master Plan takes a slightly more hard line approach than the Aviation Framework which is to be welcomed.
- 3.56 The proposed approach to dealing with noise is different to that previously taken. The 2003 Air Transport White Paper had an aim to '*bear down on noise*' and this was reflected in the 2006 Master Plan. The '*softened*' stance now taken in the Aviation Framework and subsequently the new Master Plan is regrettable.

- 3.57 There is limited data included in the Master Plan regarding noise levels at the airport compared to the 2006 Master Plan which included a significant amount of information. Such information is now contained in the Noise Action Plan (NAP). As already noted the current NAP (2010) is being reviewed in parallel to the consultation on the Master Plan but no draft NAP has been produced for consultation. Instead it is understood that the intention is to use feedback from the consultation on the Master Plan to feed in to the review of the NAP. This is somewhat confusing and does mean that there is limited information available at this time.
- 3.58 The suggestion in the Master Plan, to identify a noise envelope based on the 55 decibel night time contour takes forward a proposal in the 2010 NAP. The Aviation Framework supports the concept of Noise Envelopes and guidance issued by the Government suggests that there are a number of ways in which this could be done, including the use of noise contours (as is proposed in the Master Plan). Other approaches might include limiting inputs (e.g. limiting the number of arrivals and departures at an airport) or restricting noise impact (e.g. identifying and limiting the number of people likely to be adversely affected by noise). It is not clear as to why the preferred approach has been adopted instead of one of the alternative methods outlined above. It would be helpful if the Master Plan could address this for clarity and transparency.
- 3.59 The lack of detailed information in the Master Plan on noise makes it difficult to judge what the possible impacts are likely to be as a result of the predicted growth in Air Traffic Movements (ATM) as outlined in paragraph 3.20 Whilst aircraft are likely to get quieter through time, thereby reducing the maximum noise levels recorded, the fact that there will be such a significant increase in the number of flights could result in an increase in the continuous sound level recorded during the night time period. The airport should give consideration to undertaking separate consultation on its revised Noise Action Plan in order that stakeholders can better understand the implications of the forecasts and proposals contained in the Master Plan.

## **Community**

- 3.60 This section details how the airport will engage with the local community.

### Summary

- 3.61 A variety of activities proposed to ensure that the local community is engaged with the airport. These include:
- Holding outreach events in local communities to provide an opportunity for people to raise concerns or queries;
  - Undertaking an annual community survey and publishing a community newsletter three times a year;
  - Continuing to hold an Independent consultative committee and meet with parish councils
  - Continuing to offer sound insulation grants and roof damage repair scheme;
  - Respond to complaints within 10 working days;
  - Continue to provide a minimum of £50,000 to a community fund;
  - Continue a programme of work experience for students and aim to extend the Airport Academy to 19 year olds.

## **Comments**

- 3.62 By its nature the operation of a major airport such as East Midlands Airport is a complex matter which will inevitably encounter problems, some of which will impact on local communities. The 2006 Master Plan did not include a separate section on how the airport would engage with local communities. The inclusion of this section and the various initiatives outlined in it is therefore very welcome.
- 3.63 The Council's Community Focus team have good working relationships with the Customer Relations team at the airport and have also directed a number of local community groups to seek and receive help via the community fund. The continued commitment by the airport to this fund is welcomed.