

APPENDIX 1 DBC AND SBC JOINT REPORT

APPLICATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is some 213 (airport application only hectares in total and forms part of the main terminal complex and surrounding area at Durham Tees Valley Airport (DTVA). The application is for the extension of the airport terminal and landside/air side facilities. The application is submitted with an Environmental Statement (ES) under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999. Other than general contextual information, the ES covers a number of topic areas under the following headings:

- Alternatives and Need
- Aviation Forecasts
- Economic Impacts
- Surface Access
- Geology, Hydrology, Ground Conditions, Drainage and Flood Risk.
- Assessment of Aviation Hazard
- Landscape and Visual
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Cultural Heritage
- Ecology
- Construction Impacts
- Agricultural Impacts
- Cumulative Impacts and Impact Interaction and,
- Conclusions

In addition, and as an integral part of the ES, there are five supporting documents and these are:

- **ES Non-Technical Summary** - This summarises the Environmental Statement.
- **Planning Statement** - this sets out national and local planning policy and related national and local aviation policy in respect of the proposed developments.
- **Economic Statement** - this sets out the economic background the development proposal and deals with issues of employment generation.
- **Design Statement** - This provided additional information on the proposed nature of the development in terms of building design, scale, proposed materials etc for the those parts of the application which are applied for in outline.
- **Transport Assessment** - This examines the highways and transport issues in relation to the applications.

The airport complex is located to the south of the A67 to the east of Middleton St George. Access to the airport and surrounding areas is via two roads from the newly repositioned roundabout on the northern boundary of the site. The former main access road serves the eastern part of the airport which is characterised as being the older established commercial area including the Middleton St George Hospital (former Trees Park Village complex) SERCO and various other commercial premises. This is referred to in the ES as the North Side Commercial Area.

The new access road completed in 2004 provides a new vehicular access which principally serves the airport terminal. To the immediate north of the terminal is an area of more open land which accommodates the St George Hotel and motor homes sales site. To the east of the main terminal are various hangars and airport related buildings.

To the north west of the terminal complex is the Oak Tree residential estate which is characterised by larger family dwellings. To the west the site abuts a number of open fields and to the south are the main runway and taxi ways and former aircraft dispersal areas beyond.

The airport complex is located in open countryside characterised by fields, predominantly in agricultural use, interspersed with isolated buildings. Approximately 2km to the west is the village of Middleton St George and to the east, in the area of Stockton BC, the settlements of Yarm, Egglecliffe and Long Newton.

This application proposes the extension of the main terminal building and aircraft aprons and associated aircraft and aviation services. The application is made partly in outline, for the main terminal building and cargo facility, and in detail for the main works to the apron and related engineering works.

Some of the works proposed are likely to be permitted development under the Aviation class of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) but the applicants have included those elements in the submission for the purposes of the assessment and for completeness.

In summary the development will comprise:

- Extension and refurbishment of the existing terminal building to provide an additional 18,500m² of floor space providing a total of 28,000m². This will take the capacity of the terminal complex to 3 million passengers per annum (mppa) and will include improved baggage handling, check in facilities, lounges, office space, and retail and restaurant facilities. The extension will be linked to the existing terminal building by a single storey link.
- New aircraft gate and access structures on the airside of the terminal, with 9 additional aircraft parking stands and an additional 30,000m² of new airside apron.
- Increased parking to provide a total of 4,500 car parking spaces including staff and hire car spaces.
- Provisions of car hire facilities to accommodate storage, washing/valeting point for 150 vehicles.
- Revised access and drop off pick up facilities in front of the new terminal complex
- A cargo and maintenance village to provide a total of 20,000m² of floorspace for class B2 and B8 uses related to aviation activity and the import-export of goods. This area will include 350 parking spaces and a new apron of some 50,000m² area.
- A new parallel taxiway to the north of the existing runway
- Improved infrastructure including foul and surface water disposal, site circulation infrastructure, upgrades to local security and lighting.

The cargo and maintenance village is proposed to accommodate the following activities:

- Painting
- Engine overhaul
- General repairs

- Routine maintenance
- Aircraft interiors
- Repair and installation of avionics
- Supply and manufacture
- Training
- Air freight handling and processing

In addition, there may be a requirement to develop a foul water treatment plant within the airport boundary as part of the scheme. The other option being to connect to a new treatment works to the west of the site in Middleton One Row proposed to be built by Northumbrian Water.

The development is intended to support the continued growth of DTVA up to the year 2015 and, where possible, the ES predicts impacts to that date. On current projections the new terminal and associated aviation development will be required in 2007 when the present terminal reaches its design capacity, based on current rates of growth. The development of the cargo area and business park will be influenced by market demand.

The purpose and objective of the development as summarised by the applicant is to:

- *Provide a comprehensive improvement strategy for the airport to 2015;*
- *Enhance accessibility, including public transport improvements, increased car parking provision and improved facilities;*
- *Improve the overall functionality and image of the airport;*
- *Improve customer comfort and facilities;*
- *Ensure that the existing and projected passenger and freight can be accommodated in the most acceptable and comprehensively planned manner;*
- *Provide a comprehensively planned business park suitable for occupation and use by a range of aviation related office users;*
- *Provide dedicated airside freight and maintenance/repair/overhaul (MRO) facilities.*

PLANNING HISTORY

There have been a number of planning applications on the main terminal building and surrounding area in recent years, the most recent and relevant being:

97/00809/FUL - Erection of extension to form Euroclass lounge and relocation of existing diamond club lounge. Granted 4 February 1998.

98/00097/FUL - Construction of an extension to existing surface car park. Granted 22 May 1998.

98/00438/FUL - Extension of main apron and associated works. Granted 21 August 1998.

99/00030/FUL - Extension to baggage handling shed. Granted 26 February 1999.

99/00525/FUL - Alterations to Main Terminal Building (alterations and extensions to immigration office and administration office) Granted 17 September 1999.

03/01008/FUL - Construction of new access road. Granted 19 November 2003.

03/01136/FUL - Infill extension to Arrivals Corridor to accommodate a new class A1/A3 Retail Unit. Granted 23 December 2003.

03/01137/FUL - Extension to Arrivals Lounge. Granted 23 December 2003.

03/01138/FUL - Extension to Arrivals Hall. Granted 23 December 2003.

South Side Development

Although located mostly in the Stockton BC area, planning permission was granted by the Secretary of State in April 1999 after a Public Inquiry, for a development on the south side of the main runway comprising some 177,000m² of floorspace for industrial, warehousing and freight related development. The later phases of the master plan for that scheme do take in land in the DBC area on the south side of the runway but that would need to be the subject of a separate planning application and is not covered by the existing planning permission. SBC has granted planning permission for an application to extend the time limit for the submission of reserved matters by a further three years to 2008.

PLANNING POLICY BACKGROUND

The application is considered against a number of planning policies at the national and local level and these may be summarised as follows:

Borough of Darlington Local Plan 1997 (BDLP)

- E1 - Keynote Policy for the Protection of the Environment
- E2 - Development Limits
- E4 - New Buildings in the Countryside
- E6 - Protection of Agricultural Land
- E2 - Landscape Conservation
- E9 - Protection of Parklands
- E10 - Protection of Key Town and Landscape Features
- E11 - Conservation of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
- E12 - Trees and Development
- E14 - Landscaping of Development
- E23 - Nature and Development
- E24 - Conservation of Land and other Resources
- E25 - Energy Conservation
- E28 - Surface Water and Development
- E29 - The Setting of New Development
- E34 - Archaeological Sites of Local Importance
- E46 - Safety and Security
- E48 - Noise Generating/Polluting Development
- E49 - Noise Sensitive Development
- E50 - Hazardous Installations
- H15 - The Amenity of Residential Areas
- R1 - Designing for All
- R2 - Access for People with Disabilities
- R3 - Provision of Public Facilities
- R13 - Recreation Routes and New Development
- EP9 - Teesside Airport Land-North
- T1 - Highway and Transport Management – Existing Resources
- T2 - Highway and Transport Management – New Development

T11 - Traffic Calming - New Development
 T12 - New Development - Road Capacity
 T13 - New Development – Standards
 T24 - Parking and Servicing Requirements for New Development
 T30 - Use of Public Transport
 T31 - New Development and Public Transport
 T37 - Cycling Routes In New Development
 T39 - Conditions for Pedestrians
 T40 - New Development and Lorries
 T49 - Teesside Airport
 T52 - Drainage Infrastructure
 T53 - Sewage Treatment Works

Tees Valley Structure Plan 2004 (TVSP)

SUS1, SUS2, EMP9, ENV6, ENV7, ENV8, ENV10, ENV13, ENV16, ENV17, ENV19, ENV20, ENV23, ENV26, ENV28, ENV29, T1, T2, T4, T5, T9, T17, T18A, T25, T26, T27.

Stockton on Tees Local Plan 1997

GP1 – General Principles
 EN6 – Protection of Habitat
 EN7 – Special Landscape Areas
 EN13 – Limits to Development
 EN28 – Listed Buildings
 EN30 – Archaeological Interest
 EN31 – Protection from Pollution
 TR5 – Provision for Cyclists
 TR6 – Cycle Parking
 TR7 – Access by People with Disabilities
 TR9 – Public Transport
 TR15 – Highway Design and Parking
 TR21 – Airport Specific Policy

Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) and Planning Policy Statements (PPSs)

PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development
 PPG4 - Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms
 PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
 PPG9 - Nature Conservation
 PPS11 - Regional Spatial Strategies
 PPG13 - Transport
 PPG15 - Planning and the Historic Environment
 PPG16 - Archaeology and Planning
 PPG21 - Tourism
 PPS23 - Planning and Pollution Control
 PPG24 - Planning and Noise
 PPG25 - Development and Flood Risk

Regional Spatial Strategy

RPG1 Regional Planning Guidance for the North East (2002)
 Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East – VIEW: Shaping the North East-Submission
 Draft June 2005 and Panel Report July 2006.

Other Background Papers

A number of other reports and Government statements which provide further background and context to the application and these are referred to in the main body of the report but include:

- Aviation White Paper - The Future Of Air Transport (DETR 2003)
- Regional Air Services Studies (RAS)
- Regional Air Services Co-Ordination Study (RASCO)
- Sustainable Aviation- A strategy Towards Sustainable Development of UK Aviation (June 2005)
- Northern Way

RESULTS OF CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY

It was agreed that Darlington BC would take the lead on consultation on the applications.

DBC carried out the consultation in respect of the ES procedures and its own local publicity. SBC carried out its own local consultation and passed the comments received to this Council for consideration.

Since the two applications within the DBC area were the subject of common publicity, responses have been received which comment on either one or both of the applications. For the purposes of the reports on the two applications, responses quoting both reference numbers have been reported on each application. Each response has been assessed and points relating to each of the applications are considered in separate reports on this agenda.

The consultation section of the report is divided into two sections; first, responses received in the main from statutory consultees as a result of the consultation on the ES and second, the results of local consultation from individual residents and interested parties.

Statutory Consultees and Responses from the Environmental Assessment (EA) Procedures

Government Office for the North East

Acknowledge receipt of the application.

Regional Assembly

The application for the expansion of airport facilities is consistent with the approach taken by RPG1 Policies T17 and EL7 of the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The proposals detailed in the application are for specifically airport related uses and on focussed on the airfield itself. This approach is in general conformity with RPG1 and the emerging RSS.

Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit

- *The proposed expansion of passenger and freight handling facilities is welcomed and conforms, in principle, with policies in the existing and emerging Regional Spatial Strategy and the adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan to develop and improve facilities at Durham Tees Valley Airport;*
- *The proposal will make a valuable contribution to the economic generation of the Tees Valley;*

- *The current proposals have been assessed on the basis that the A66/Long Newton Interchange improvement will be completed by 2006. With this improvement now delayed until at least 2008, further work may be requested by the Highways Agency to assess the impact of the proposals on the existing road network and the effect of increased traffic on local residents; The Borough Council's should be satisfied that the initiatives set out in the draft Airport Surface Access Strategy to improve public transport accessibility are implemented effectively and accompanied by the necessary investment and, when necessary, adequate mitigation measures should be implemented to reduce the effect of aircraft and other noise on nearby residents.*

Middlesbrough Council

No objections.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council

No comments.

Hartlepool Borough Council

No objections, comment on the archaeological issues and the possibility of improving surface access to the airport in particular the rail link to the site from the east.

Hambleton District Council

- *The development is seen as an advantage to local companies within the District as the development will be of benefit to economic development in the area.*
- *Main concerns are in respect of aircraft noise and air pollution and comment that some properties in the Over Dinsdale area will be affected by increased aircraft traffic. Suggest a trigger level for any proposed noise insulation grant scheme and that controls on night flying are introduced via conditions/ quota count system and a noise tracking system introduced.*

Sedgefield Borough Council

No comments.

Richmondshire District Council

Comment that noise data shows parts of the Borough affected by noise contours, the Authority considers there to be a potential for noise nuisance and recommends the lowest trigger level for any sound insulation grants(SIGS) scheme. In addition suggests the quota count agreed for the South Side development should be reduced and tighter controls introduced over night flying.

A second letter confirms that whilst it is acknowledged there will be benefits to the development there is concern over the noise impacts of the development and the terms of any S106 Agreement should:

- *The 90db SEL footprint be used for the qualification of the Sound Insulation Grants System (SIGS)*
- *That should the above not be agreed, the qualification for SIGS should be lowered*
- *The contribution of the airport to the SIGS should be 100% and increased to £2400*
- *The quota count should be reduced from 20,000*
- *Limits should apply to QC/8 and QC/4 during 2300 hours to 0700 hours*
- *The noise contours to be reviewed every year instead of two years*
- *That the S106 includes provision for a penalty system to be agreed by the Noise Monitoring Sub Committee to be imposed on airlines which breach agreed noise limits.*

North Yorkshire County Council

The Council has no objections to the proposed expansion; in particular it is considered that the development will have economic benefits for North Yorkshire in terms of access to employment, growth in the local economy and access to distribution and freight facilities. Its expansion will also provide further scope for attracting tourists to the area.

Durham County Council (Archaeology)

No objections.

Durham County Council (Transport Policy)

- *The Council, in principle, welcomes the improvements to the airport as it is regarded as an important part of the regions transport system and its development would be beneficial to the residents and businesses of County Durham.*
- *There is concern regarding surface access to the airport and the growth of airport related traffic travelling through the County and the Councils should ensure that strategies to promote access to the site by means other than the car e.g. travel plans are implemented. Parking levels to be justified so as not to provide a dis-incentive to public transport use.*
- *Expansion of the airport should include plans to improve the railway station halt.*
- *A high quality terminal building is proposed and is an asset to the area but its impact should not be reduced by excessive amounts of surface parking, which if needed should be landscaped.*
- *DCC will be exploring the possibility of an airport park and ride scheme as part of its next LTP.*
- *The imposition of a condition limiting the use of the cargo village to airfreight only would be supported.*

North Eastern Chambers of Commerce

NECC consulted with Chambers in the Tees Valley and County Durham Areas and comment as follows:

- *Air travel is becoming increasingly important to businesses in the North East region. Access to quality air passenger and freight transport is essential to the sustainability and growth of business. Airfreight is considered as a competitive alternative to land/sea freight and as such increased cargo capacity is welcomed.*
- *The development at the airport is seen as a vital component in the regeneration of the area, providing substantial opportunities for both the local and regional economies as well as helping the North East realise its full potential. The investment will help DTVA attract and retain new routes and operators.*
- *Concern expressed in the delay of the A66 junction improvement at Long Newton but fully supports application.*

Highways Agency

The Highways Agency have considered the contents of the EA and Transport Assessment carried out by the applicants. The HA are satisfied that, subject to a number of planning conditions relating to off site highway works, that the proposed development will not prejudice the free flow of traffic on the trunk road network.

Countryside Agency

No objections.

Environment Agency (Flooding/Water Quality/Ecology/Ground Water and Contaminated Land)

No objections subject to the imposition of a range of planning conditions on any planning permission.

Northumbrian Water

Initial objection withdrawn, satisfied that any grant of planning permission be subject to a planning condition relating to foul and surface water disposal. Comment that the ability to accept and treat the effluent from the development is reliant on our ability to secure planning permission for new works at Middleton St George.

NEDL

No objections, comments in respect of local apparatus.

Network Rail

No comments.

DTVA Safeguarding

No objection subject to assessment of detailed of lighting schemes and landscaping etc.

Durham Constabulary

Comment on security aspects of the proposal.

English Heritage

No objections; comments in respect of archaeology.

English Nature (now Natural England)

An initial objection was received but after additional survey work and presentation of a mitigation strategy in relation to nature impacts Natural England have confirmed they now have no objections to the proposal subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

Middleton St George Parish Council

A letter has been submitted by planning consultants England and Lyle on behalf of the Parish Council it comments:

The Parish Council is not objecting to this application. The expansion and further improvement of facilities at the airport is supported but there must be safeguards for local residents in Middleton St George and in other local communities that may suffer adversely from the expansion of the airport.

There are concerns regarding traffic, night flying additional noise from aircraft and light pollution from the large areas to be used as car parking

The deal with these concerns the Parish Council believes it is essential that strict controls are imposed on the grant of planning permission so that any risk of adverse effects in minimised. We urge the Council to use Section 106 obligations or planning conditions to ensure the following matters are addressed:

- *The expanded airport terminal and associated car parks should not be open to the public until offsite improvements on the A66 trunk road have been fully completed and opened to*

traffic including the grade separated junction at Long Newton and improvements to the junction of the A67 and A66 Morton Park at a level acceptable to the Highways Agency;

- *No aircraft movements should be allowed to or from the airport between the hours of 2300 hours and 0700 hours except in an emergency to protect the local community from noise from night time operations;*
- *Appropriate levels of noise from aircraft shall be agreed with the airport owners and an independent system of regular noise monitoring should be set which is controlled by the Borough Council;*
- *Lighting at the airport should be designed to minimise light pollution that may cause nuisance to local residents.*

Durham Wildlife Trust

Detailed survey of Great Crested Newt and Water Vole presence is required. DWT objects to the loss of so much unimproved grassland. Detailed surveys of reptiles should be undertaken. DWT objects to the application until detailed surveys are undertaken and appropriate mitigation is formulated and agreed.

CPRE (Joint Submission by Darlington and Stockton Branches)

Express concern on the following points:

- *If developed the airport will become a substantial physical presence by the year 2015, with the expansion of Darlington and Stockton there is significant urban sprawl taking place. Our ultimate concern is beyond 2015 and we understand a study is going to be undertaken which could involve further expansion.*
- *The opportunity should be taken to serve the airport by re-aligned rail line and station halt.*
- *Light pollution on the Oak Tree area and the impact of headlights shining into residential properties.*
- *Delay in the provision of the Long Newton interchange on the A66.*
- *Impact of the development in terms of noise impacts on residential properties is not accurately assessed and is misleading.*
- *We do not accept the definition of what constitutes a serious nuisance.*
- *The development, if approved, should be on the basis on the elimination of regular night time flights.*

CPRE (North Yorkshire Branch)

- *The Airport needs to take all reasonable steps to reduce global warming.*
- *Rail link could be expanded to reduce reliance on the car.*
- *Platforms should be included in the main terminal.*

Long Newton Parish Council

Object to the application. The application pre-supposes the completion of the Long Newton Interchange on the A66, now delayed. The development should not be approved until the Long Newton Interchange has been re-programmed and an implementation date agreed.

Egglescliffe Parish Council

In general the Council supports the plans for the development of the airport with the benefit of extra employment and travel destinations. There is concern at the increase in traffic in the local area and the delay in the Long Newton interchange.

Ward Councillor for Cowtons Ward (Hambleton DC)

- *Concern over the impact of increased aircraft movement on residents of Girsby and Over Dinsdale.*
- *The ES cannot properly measure the effect of over 100 flights on a low lying area.*
- *Outdoor leisure pursuits would be seriously affected*
- *A certain amount of expansion is to be expected but a trebling of traffic is more than the area can take.*
- *Do not think permission should be given for such a large expansion and suggests an expansion of 50% should be the limit.*
- *Appreciate all parties wish to seek expansion but there must be doubts about the ability of the airport to generate the extra traffic in view of the size of the local population and expansion at Newcastle Airport and other northern airports .*
- *If approved all properties in the Over Dinsdale Parish will need soundproofing.*

Elementis Chromium

Concern expressed at road safety aspects of the development at the airport. Road safety issues must be addressed directly and comprehensively through the revision of the submissions made.

Middleton Hall

The development outlined in the application would have an adverse impact on Middleton Hall operating as a care home and with proposals for further development. However, suitable tree screening and noise protection to the west of the business park and to the west of Robinsons' plantation could alleviate these concerns. In the planning applications as they stand, there does not appear to be sufficient screening and protection to reduce the impact on Middleton Hall and the protected parkland area. On this basis we object to both applications.

North East Process Cluster Industry (NEPIC)

NEPIC is the North's biggest industrial sector with over 200 members and represents the interests of the pharmaceutical, speciality and bio technology companies in the north east and has a particularly strong concentration in the Tees Valley Sub Region.

As NEPIC members operate in such a global business sector, good international air links are an essential requirement and the services of DTVA to Heathrow and Amsterdam are highly valued. NEPIC regards the investment being made in DTVA as ensuring the Tees Valley economy remains competitive and can secure sustainable growth.

Huntsman Petrochemical Limited

Support the application commenting, in such a global business as chemical manufacturing good international air links are essential requirements and many of the services at DTVA are highly valued. Huntsman welcomes the investment being made in ensuring the Tees Valley economy remains competitive.

DDS Structural Steelwork

Support the development of the airport which is vital to their business operations.

Redworth Hall Hotel

The development would benefit the hotel and related industries in the area, improvements to the services proved by the airport would attract customers from a wider UK market.

Solmek

The development of the airport would aid the economic development of the region. Such communications are an essential factor in our success.

Affinity Healthcare

Our company is located in the airport boundary. The development of the airport will aid the general economy of the area and create jobs opportunities.

Geoffrey Robinson

The airport is used by the company for frequent business trips. The development of the airport will be beneficial to the local environment and improve connections to businesses in the Teesside area.

Du Pont

Support the improvement of infrastructure in the local area. At present many of our managers travel frequently throughout Europe and a great deal of our business is dependant on exports. The limits on present services often require route via other airports to reach destinations.

PD Ports plc

Express support for the expansion of the airport. Earlier this year the company were acquired by an Australian based company BBI who are committed to the expansion of the business particularly Teesport. With over 700 employees the company has significant expansion plans. The continued expansion of the business is predicated on good connectivity for both business and leisure travellers.

Results of Local Consultation

A total of 1,256 objections and representations on the airport expansion proposal itself have been received as a result of local consultation, although this does include an element of double counting where people have sent more than one response.

Some of the responses have taken the form of “standard letters” signed and returned by local residents.

The letters state in respect of the airport expansion application:

206 object to the application for the following reasons:

- *At a presentation by the Airport Manager it was stated categorically that with the proposed increase in flight traffic, including freight, there would have to be air traffic during the whole of the night. Until now, other than emergencies, flights do not occur between 23:30 and 06:00. Objection is raised on the grounds of sleep deprivation to any flights between 23:30 and 06:00. Even busy airports such as Heathrow and Manchester do not impose night flights on the neighbours.*

15 object to the application for the following reasons:

- *Object to there being no restrictions on night flying which will, affect Darlington, Stockton and Middlesbrough.*

9 object to the application for the following reasons:

- *Attempt by the developer to bulldoze through their planning consent with no consideration or local involvement of the local communities.*
- *The need for all domestic properties to be Council Tax re-assessed as a result of property de-valuation and impact on quality of life from pollution, air noise road and air traffic, crime will also increase in the form of car theft and petty theft causing concern in the area.*

A total of 93 further individual objections and representations were received making the following comments:

- *Adverse impact on the village and change in the character of the local area;*
- *Supply should only follow clear demand for development;*
- *The development on the south side of the airport will result in loss of countryside and views with added noise in the area;*
- *The development will result in increased noise and light pollution and in increase in security and crime worries;*
- *Welcome the development of the airport but object to business park;*
- *Impact of noise and light emissions on local residential properties;*
- *Development will result in additional traffic on the local road network which is not adequate;*
- *The airport should remain small and not grow like Manchester or Heathrow;*
- *The development will devalues local property;*
- *The development will result in an increase in local pollution;*
- *The development will result in marked increase in noise levels both day and night which will disturb sleep and reduce quality of life for residents closest to the airport;*
- *Inappropriate development next to a residential area;*
- *Impact of 20m light columns and light which are too powerful;*
- *Developers should draw up a light pollution strategy;*
- *Additional noise from runway;*
- *Object to all aspects of the development;*
- *The cargo and maintenance village will increase the number of cargo flights and freight traffic which will result in more heavy traffic to and from the airport which in turn will create more noise and nuisance;*
- *Adverse impact from night flying;*
- *Development should not proceed before the A66 is upgraded;*
- *Impact of more noise, traffic, pollution and smell from fuel;*
- *Improvement in public transport has a low priority in the application, current public transport is poor, express bus will add to congestion, rail link at airport should be exploited, bus link to Dinsdale station is a non-starter because of the access in the village;*
- *The development will worsen the traffic situation locally;*
- *Object to the size and location of the parking facilities;*
- *The current car park is underused and could be repaired so there is no need for greenfield development;*
- *Underground or two storey car parks could be built to prevent need for use of greenfield site;*
- *Security needs to be increased and use of land decreased;*
- *Parking provision is not in proportion to passenger numbers;*
- *A shuttle should operate to the rail halt;*
- *The plans are too ambitious for the local road network;*
- *The risk from an air accident will be increased and is not “tolerable” as stated in the ES;*

- *Air pollution will be much greater than stated as will impact of emissions on environment;*
- *Suspect that no demand for development proposed since northern region has Newcastle and Leeds/Bradford;*
- *The proposal is too radical;*
- *The south side development has already been granted and development should take place there away from residential properties;*
- *The development sets a precedent for the erosion of the countryside around Middleton St George;*
- *The terminal expansion will impact on local businesses;*
- *The development will reduce enjoyment of the local countryside;*
- *The development will destroy greenbelt, natural habitats and wildlife which will be concreted over;*
- *It will be the ruin of the village;*
- *Impact from revving of engines in the maintenance facility;*
- *Chaos from construction period;*
- *Why should the airport seek to compete with European airports, the residents will pay the price of expansion;*
- *The development will impact on the peace in the local countryside and impact on local wildlife and character;*
- *The development will overload the sewerage treatment works;*
- *Development should not proceed without the full views of the community;*
- *Applicant is forcing the decision through;*
- *Appalled expansion is being considered at all;*
- *There is no justification for further flights at the airport;*
- *Unnecessary assault of the environment for profits;*
- *Only business flights will be beneficial;*
- *Growth in holiday flights is detrimental to the UK economy and results in spending abroad;*
- *No need to use public money on the project which is not necessary or value for money;*
- *Cannot justify expansion of most polluting and damaging form of transport to the environment;*
- *The development is contrary to policy on climate change;*
- *Four years ago DBC refused permission for the cargo facility which was allowed on appeal;*
- *The ES says only a small proportion of house holders are affected but to them it is 100% impact;*
- *The proposal is contrary to the Human Right Act;*
- *Impact on protected birds and other species from noise and disturbance;*
- *Impact of daily flight of gulls not taken into account and decision should be deferred;*
- *Support new sewage treatment plant;*
- *Plans must be moderated, they are out of proportion to the area and business case*
- *No objection if done in a considerate manner;*
- *ES is unbalanced and sympathetic to the development and underestimates impact of noise;*
- *Question validity of growth figures;*
- *Cargo and terminal development not linked and should be separate applications;*
- *Hotel should be demolished and site used for parking so fields are not;*
- *The employment gain figures should be clearly evidenced;*
- *Safety assessment inadequate and does not take account of difficult approaches to the airport;*
- *Impact on Heritage and highly rated residential properties which will be devalued by the expansion;*

- *The increase in passenger numbers will result in increase emissions and pollution contrary to the objectives of the RSS;*
- *When the White Paper was produced it referred to an area which was sparsely populated, this is no longer the case;*
- *If the Government abolish the VAT exemption on aviation fuel this will increase costs and reduce passenger numbers, the Council should no accept the applicants projections but should have the figure independently verified;*
- *No evidence the jobs projected will result, Newcastle Airport employs fewer people than before it expanded;*
- *The applicants and agents have refused to answer questions in respect of the developments in certain areas and residents have carried out their own research and raise further objection is raised on grounds of:*
 - *Increased emissions from aircraft movements;*
 - *the approval of a Quota Count of 20,000 by Stockton BC will result in up to 26 arrivals/departures per night, a lot even for a regional airport;*
 - *concern is expressed about the size of aircraft to be used and the type of freight to be brought in;*
 - *the sleep deprivation and emissions estimates are understated and will be greater than those projected;*
 - *the risk of accidents is much grater given the proximity to other airports and RAF Leeming;*
- *The development promotes unsustainable transport with global implications;*
- *The application flies in the face of evidence from Friends of the Earth which states that all regions except London run a huge economic deficit from aviation;*
- *Stockton BC should not have granted permission for 26 night time aircraft movements and Darlington BC should reverse this decision;*
- *Darlington BC should take a more environmentally ethical stance and refuse the applications in their current format since Darlington has been chosen as a model area for transport planning;*
- *Evidence collected in relation to Robin Hood airport shows a net loss to the economy and an overestimate of the catchment to the airport, this application is based on similar faulty assumptions.*

698 standard letters of objection were received in the period October 2005 objecting to both applications for the following reasons:

- *The proposal to develop greenfield land which is outside of the planning envelope for any purpose whatsoever, now or at any time in the future.*
- *Sleep deprivation, traffic congestion, light, noise, security and emissions pollution that the above development will have on residents within the immediate vicinity.*
- *The effect that this development will have on many species of wildlife, including deer that have made this their home for decades.*
- *Unrestricted night flying which is not allowed at other airports and the effect this will have on both the immediate residents and the wider community on both sides of the Durham/Stockton border.*
- *The refusal of the developers to provide an alternative application to their proposals for a business park on greenfield land.*
- *If approved I will seek a review of my tax band.*

The letter concludes by asking the Planning Authority insists a revised alternative application is produced given the amount of vacant land available at the airport.

In addition to the above, a further 161 letters have been received, most in the form of a standard letter, from residents in Long Newton objecting to both the applications on the grounds that the development should not be granted or proceed unless the proposed Long Newton Interchange on the A66 is constructed. Since the Government has reversed a decision on the timing of the funding of that project, it is appropriate to deal with the application on the basis of the submitted Transport Assessment which assumes the provision of the new junction. The matter is proposed to be dealt with through the imposition of an appropriate form of condition which has been agreed with the Highways Agency.

Responses have also been received from service departments within Darlington and Stockton Borough Councils but these are dealt with in the Planning Issues section of the report.

PLANNING ISSUES

The principal issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- *whether the proposed development complies with the development plan and planning policy at the national level in relation to airport development;*
- *consideration of the Environmental Assessment submission, particularly in respect of development control issues;*
- *consideration of any proposed mitigation measures that will minimise the identified and quantified impacts and external effects of the development on the locality should permission be granted; and*
- *the implications of the development proposed in respect of employment creation and investment.*

The approach taken in this section of the report is to explain the methodology of the ES; to consider the planning policy background to the application and the principle of growth at the airport as set out in national, regional and local planning and aviation policy and, finally, to consider the detailed development control issues raised by the application/ES and associated documents under the identified specific topic areas and to assess those matters in respect of planning and related policies.

Environmental Statement Methodology

The ES covers both planning applications within the Darlington BC area and the airport related application covering part of the Stockton BC area and, whilst it is possible to apply the ES individually to the applications, there is a degree of overlap in some subject areas.

The ES includes a *master plan* which shows the development proposals in the context of the airport. The main part of the applications for both the Terminal Extension and Business Park have been applied for in outline but the applications does contain what are referred to as *parameters plans* which provide supporting additional information on the proposed development.

These parameters plans fix the proposed development in terms of scale, description, location, heights of buildings, maximum floorspace and areas of specific uses, for the assessment of impacts.

The general approach in all Environmental Assessment studies is to define *baseline* or present conditions in this case as at 2004, from which to measure development impacts. The ES then goes on to consider four *development scenarios* and these may be summarised as follows:

Baseline Projection (Defined as No Development 1)

This scenario considers the position if no further development, committed or approved, takes place to enlarge or enhance airport capacity. The existing aviation capacity of the airport is in the region of 1.2 mppa (millions passenger per annum) and approximately 7,600 tonnes of cargo. Low case aviation growth projections indicate capacity at the existing terminal will be reached in 2007. Following 2007 it is assumed airport traffic will remain constant and growth will cease.

Baseline Projection with Committed Development (Defined as No Development 2)

This scenario takes account of committed development on the baseline situation and primarily relates to the “South Side” development. This development was the subject of an Environmental Assessment at the time of the decision to grant planning permission by the First Secretary of State after a planning inquiry. This current ES takes into account the impact of that proposed development as part of the alternative baseline conditions as this scheme represents development approved but not yet implemented.

Impact 1 (Defined as Baseline with Application Development)

This considers the impact on baseline conditions of the two proposed developments the subject of the current application, in isolation i.e. excluding the South Side Development.

Impact 2 (Defined as Baseline with Committed Development and Application Development)

This considers the impact on baseline conditions of the proposed two new developments together with the committed South-Side development and is sometimes referred to as the benchmark for the *worst case* scenario for predicting impacts since it relates to the greatest quantum of development.

The applicants have carried out the ES in a format that allows for consideration of the development, the subject of the current application, to be considered in isolation should the committed South Side development not be implemented. The ES also assumes high growth forecasts in order that a worst case scenario is assessed in terms of impacts. Consideration has also been given to the type of impact, intensity character and duration.

In carrying out the assessment not all the scenarios have need to be applied since if, for example, the study assesses the impacts of the Impact 2 scenario, the worst case, and these are found to be acceptable, there is no need to consider the position in terms of the impact of a lesser amount of development. This is the case in respect of Risk Assessment, Air Quality and Noise.

The applicants have confirmed that the ES and the process of analysis have been used to incorporate into the development, mitigation measures and enhancements to the scheme to minimise or eliminate impacts and the ES has informed the mitigation strategy to limit specific identified and quantified impacts.

Alternatives and Need

In this section of the ES the applicant considers reasonable alternatives to the development site and broad indicators of the need for the development.

The ES comments that the application should be viewed in the context of the White Paper (The Future of Air Transport 2003) which sets out Government strategy for airport growth.

The White Paper identifies the economic, social and cultural benefits of increased air travel and the role of airports as economic drivers. The aim is to balance the impacts of growth on the local population, against the damage to the economy that will result from nil investment and growth. The start point for the strategy is to expand, where appropriate, the existing regional airports before considering the provision of new sites and the White Paper clearly identifies those regional airports that are considered capable of expansion subject to detailed consideration of the impacts of expansion.

Durham Tees Valley Airport is identified as being one of the locations. The Government's view is that the site has the important advantage that very low numbers of people are affected by noise and, with ongoing access improvements, it states there are no major impediments to its future expansion. The principle of the expansion of DTVA is, therefore, supported as part of the national strategy which itself seeks to balance the issues of economic growth and environmental concerns. There is no specific requirement to re-examine the principle of the development and expansion of aviation services at the airport but the Council is, nevertheless, required to assess the detail of any expansion proposals and the impacts on local populations.

The ES goes on to consider the consequences of the No Development 1 scenario and the potential alternative locations for the development. The ES concludes that it is not appropriate to consider potential alternative uses for the site since it is established as a civilian airport.

The ES concludes the No Development 1 scenario will result in capacity being reached in 2007 and that the airport would remain at that level for the remainder of the master plan period up to 2015. The key implications of the scenario are summarised as;

- The aims of the White Paper and aviation development strategy would not be met;
- The ability of the UK to meet projected demand in a structured way minimising environmental harm would be compromised;
- The airport would not fulfil its recognised role as an economic driver in the region and may decline in absolute terms compared to the growth of other regional airports;
- The functionality of the airport and customer service would be compromised;
- Services would be constrained to all airport users and businesses and the image of the airport would suffer;
- Public transport improvements would not take place resulting in less sustainable access options;
- Growth would take place at other regional airports with associated environmental costs;
- Loss of proposed employment floor space and employment opportunities.

The no development scenario is not an acceptable option in the context of the White Paper since significant local and regional benefits will flow from the development with relatively limited environmental impacts.

The ES concludes there are no alternative locations for the aviation services development proposed for the following reasons:

- The site is already an airport and the application relates to the expansion and development of established services.
- DTVA is identified in the White Paper as a location for expansion.

- Expansion at other airports is already proposed as part of the White Paper strategy, expansion at those sites is additional to the development proposed not an alternative to it.
- The provision of the cargo village and business floorspace is directly related to the expansion of aviation services, location at an alternative airport or on site remote from the airport but in the district would not meet this local demand.
- The cargo and MRO floorspace is required because current infrastructure at the airport cannot meet demand; this is a development complementary to the expansion to passenger services.

The ES concludes that the development is consistent with the structured and balanced growth sought by the White Paper and that DTVA is an integral part of that strategy. The demand for the additional development is directly linked to the projected growth of the airport and, given the linkages between that growth and the proposed infrastructure, there are no practical alternative locations for the development other than within, and close to, the terminal area.

On the basis of this section of the ES the officer's view is that the applicants have demonstrated the need for the proposed development and that alternative locations for the terminal expansion are not practical or consistent with national policy and strategy relating to the development of regional airports.

Aviation White Paper and Associated Background Papers

National policy in respect of aviation development is set out in the Aviation White Paper published by the DETR in 2003.

This sets out a strategic framework for the development of airport capacity in the UK over the next 30 years. This policy document should carry significant weight in the determination of any application for airport related development. The main aim of that policy is to encourage the growth of regional airports in a sustainable fashion. The Paper sets out clearly, the recognised advantages to regional airport growth in terms of economic growth, travel, reduction of impacts at existing airports, less pressure to develop new sites, exploiting existing capacity and providing certainty in planning for future growth.

In respect of Durham Tees Valley Airport the Paper concludes:

“Extensions to both terminal facilities and runway length and enhancements to the existing taxiway system could be provided within the existing airport land. We consider therefore that there are no major impediments to the future expansion of Teesside (DTVA) and we support this.”

The development the subject of this application is consistent with this overall policy statement.

The Regional Air Services (RAS) Study (The Future of Air Transport in the UK: North of England) is the consultation paper which relates to DTVA. This paper set out detailed analysis of future growth forecasts and infrastructure development necessary to support growth. In respect of DTVA it concluded that improvements would be required to taxiway provision, terminal facilities, possible runway extension, and improvements to access. The study concludes some 33,000 jobs could be created by 2030 through airport development in the northern region mostly in the north-west, Manchester, but in respect of noise impacts it states;

“Humberside and Teesside are located in rural environments; growth would therefore have zero or minimal impacts under all future scenarios considered.”

The study also forecast little or no impact in terms of air quality and local ecology.

The study acknowledged the current and proposed improvements to the local road and trunk road networks, forecast a parking need of some 4,000-6,000 spaces up to 2030 and the potential for job creation in the Tees Valley area.

The Regional Air Services Co Ordination (RASCO) Study added to the RAS report in respect of DTVA. It further considered a number of issues and concluded:

- Further expansion of the terminal and associated aprons and taxiways will be required.
- Car parking forecast can be accommodated at the airport subject to assessment of local impacts.
- The expansion will provide employment opportunities and associated regeneration benefits to the local area.

The officer view is that the proposed development, being related to the aviation industry and the expansion of the DTVA, is consistent with these policy statements and strategies.

Other planning policy and related statements are contained in published planning guidance notes and planning policy statements (PPGs/PPSs) and these are considered as part of the planning policy assessment in this report.

The Development Plan

Regional Spatial Strategy

Regional planning policy is set out in RPG1 (Regional Planning Guidance) published 2002. As a result of recent legislative changes the RPG is now to be replaced by the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) which was submitted to the Secretary of state in June 2005, subject to Examination In Public Panel Report in July 2006 and form part of the Development Plan.

RPG1 recognises the region's need for first class global transport connections and concludes that:

“Such (airport) development is vital to achieving the overarching objectives of regeneration, opportunity and accessibility”,

Accordingly Policy T17 states that plans should assist the growth of DTVA and Newcastle airports in meeting the demand for travel from within the catchment by:

- *protecting land to meet demand for runway, terminal, freight and maintenance facilities;*
- *protecting flight corridors against development, which would prejudice air safety; and*
- *protecting land adjacent to the airport related facilities.*

In response to consultation on the application the North East Assembly concluded:

“Application number 1 for the expansion of the airport facilities is consistent with the approach taken by RPG1 polices T17 and EL7 and the emerging RSS. The proposals detailed in the application are specifically for airport related uses and are focussed on the airfield itself. This approach is in general conformity with RPG1 and the emerging RSS.”

Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (JSU) concluded in their response to consultation, inter alia:

- *The proposed expansion of passenger and freight handling facilities is welcomed and conforms in principle with policies in the existing and emerging RSS and the adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan.*
- *The proposal will make a valuable contribution to the economic regeneration of the Tees Valley.*
- *The current proposals are assessed on the basis the A66 Long Newton Interchange will be built.*
- *The Councils should be satisfied that the initiatives set out in the draft Airport Surface Access Strategy are implemented and adequately resourced.*
- *Where necessary adequate measures should be implemented to reduce the effect of aircraft and other noise on nearby residents.*

The recently published Panel Report into the draft RSS is supportive of the development of the airport to around 3mppa and proposes no change to Policy 7 which encourages the growth of passenger and freight services from DTVA to link the region to international markets. The Panel noted that *“the Region’s airports are strong economic drivers and are increasingly important to the Region’s economic well being”*.

The suggested changes to the draft policy in the RSS relate to a new list of airport related uses set out in a published table and the amendment of the draft policy that may allow for some exceptions to the airport/aviation qualification for development on the airport site. The RSS Panel Report concludes that there is no conflict between the RSS and the Aviation White Paper.

In view of the above comments the development is considered to be consistent with the RPG and emerging RSS and the key policy in the TVSP (policy EMP9).

Local Planning Policy

Borough of Darlington Local Plan(BDLP) and Tees Valley Structure Plan Policy(TVSP) in relation to the Airport

The application site is located outside the approved development limits identified in the BDLP. Policy E2 (Development Limits) states that outside those limits planning permission would normally only be granted for a limited number of developments appropriate to a countryside location. An exception to that policy is expressed in policy EP9 which states;

**POLICY EP9 - Teesside Airport Employment Land – North
DEVELOPMENT REQUIRING A LOCATION AT OR ADJACENT TO AN AIRPORT
WILL BE PERMITTED AT TEESSIDE AIRPORT TO THE NORTH OF THE MAIN
RUNWAY IN THE VICINITY OF THE AIRPORT TERMINAL**

Policy EMP9 of the Tees Valley Structure Plan states:

EMP9

**AT TEESSIDE AIRPORT, 225HA OF LAND WILL BE PROVIDED FOR PROPOSALS
REQUIRING A LOCATION AT OR ADJACENT TO THE AIRPORT.**

The development relates to the expansion of the main terminal and development of the aviation services from the site and all development is located close to or adjacent to the airport terminal

and generally within the area of the airport itself. Although outside approved development limits identified in the BDLP and TVSP the proposal is consistent with policy relating to the development of the airport and is acceptable in terms of policy E2 and EP9 of the BDLP and EMP9, ENV13 and ENV19 of the TVSP.

Stockton on Tees Local Plan

Objective 7 of the STLP support the maintenance and development of DTVA. Policy TR21 states:

PLANNING PERMISSION MAY BE GRANTED AT TEESSIDE AIRPORT FOR B1 AND B2 USES RELATED TO AVIATION OR FOR THE OPERATIONAL NEEDS OF THE AIRPORT PROVIDED THAT:

- (I) THE DEVELOPMENT DOES NOT HARM THE NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST OF THE AREA;**
- (II) SUBSTANTIAL LANDSCAPING IS INCORPORATED TO SCREEN AND INTEGRATE NEW DEVELOPMENT; AND**
- (III) IT CAN BE SHOWN THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT GIVE RISE TO AN AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE AMENITIES OF RESIDENTS IN NEARBY VILLAGES OR EAGLESCLIFFE.**

Evaluation of the Environmental Assessment and Application of Local Planning Policy

The remainder of this report considers the ES by subject area and, where appropriate, assesses the application against policy from the Borough of Darlington Local Plan (BDLP) and the Tees Valley Structure Plan (TVSP) and published planning guidance (PPGs and PPSs)

In respect of each section of the EA this report provides a synopsis of the information provided and then describes the baseline and projected development scenario impacts, and then, finally, impact mitigation measures are identified.

Aviation Forecasts

Synopsis of EA Information

This section of the ES describes future growth scenarios at the airport in terms of aircraft movement and passenger numbers. This analysis underpins the justification for the scale and nature of the development and deals with passenger numbers and freight and general aviation activity under the following categories; international charter, international scheduled, domestic scheduled and low cost carrier (LCC).

Freight is measured in tonnage and general aviation (GA) relates to flying clubs, military traffic etc.

All of these sectors are described in *movements* that is, any aircraft landing or taking off Air Transport Movements (ATM) are any landing or departure of an aircraft engaged in the transport of passengers or freight on a commercial basis and passengers per annum (PPA) This generally includes all arrivals and departures of aircraft, excluding general aviation.

The ES provides a commentary on current *Baseline* levels of activity, recent trends and projections for growth for each sector up to the planning year 2015. The same projections are used to underpin other topic assessments such as noise, air quality and risk.

Baseline Assessment

In 2003 the airport handled some 700,000 passengers. The airport achieved a growth rate of some 12.8% from 1993 to 2000 and declined in 2000-2002 due to economic slowdown and the events of 9/11. Traffic recovered in 2002-03 to grow at a rate of 4.6%, the national rate being 5%.

Recent growth at the airport has been as a result of the introduction of low cost carriers (LCCs) and other increased activity although there has been some restructuring of the market in terms of holiday flights. DTVA provides for a number of holiday destinations and places great reliance on internal routes such as the daily service to London and, it is assumed, much of this is business related. Similarly the 20,000 passengers using the Aberdeen service in 2003 are primarily related to the oil and gas industry. Other key services include Dublin, mainly a leisure service and Amsterdam providing a link to Schiphol a key transport hub in Europe providing a link to 200 destinations worldwide.

Air Transport Movement (ATMs) figures are closely linked to passengers carried and *load factors* i.e. the proportion of seats occupied. Low cost carriers and international carriers traditionally have high load factors with other services being lower. This will impact on ATM trends and at DTVA ATMs over the last 10 years have fallen with fewer aircraft carrying larger numbers as airlines respond to increased demand with larger aircraft rather than more frequent services. The average ratio of passengers per aircraft has stabilised at 70-80 in recent years but is expected to increase with more low cost carriers.

Freight movements are mainly express parcel transportation e.g. TNT who also have a European maintenance facility at DTVA but cargo growth has been held back by lack of facilities. Cargo tonnage peaked in 2000 at 3000 tonnes but has fallen back to an average of 1,000 tonnes pa. This is expected to grow if facilities improve. Cargo ATMs in 2003 were 350. Other cargo includes mail which is expected to decline.

The general aviation category includes club flying, flying schools and local air movements e.g. FRA Aviation. The airport also deals with military traffic, crew training and what are termed positioning flights by operators not based at the airport.

The total ATMs at the airport reached a peak of 13,000 in 19948 and have recently declined to around just over 9,000 in 2003.

Forecasts for Growth

The projections are based on what is termed the Propensity to Fly (PTF) i.e. flights per head of population and is related to services offered and disposable income etc. PTF projections to 2030 are extracted from Government figures on the White Paper. The PTF for the north east in 2000 was 0.57 and is predicted to rise to 1.59 by 2030. This indicates a significant increase in the demand for air travel in the region which will be influenced by improvements to services and facilitates.

The expansion of the airport has been compromised by lack of investment and the quality of the terminal and services offered and the development proposed will allow DTVA to draw more passenger trade from its natural catchment area within 2 hours travel time.

The ES models growth on the basis of accepted practice both in the UK and US in relation to air transport and with data from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) collated annually. From this

modelling it is estimated that 88% of the total traffic at DTVA originates from the north east region with 41% of the market showing DTVA is the most convenient for scheduled and charter traffic. Freight forecast are against a background of growth at 7% per annum over the last decade and local patterns of business at the airport and General Aviation (projections are based on national forecasts and local patterns of business and expressions of interest).

Passenger Forecasts

Two scenarios are presented in the ES, Low Case, which assumes no development at the airport beyond its present capacity and High Case, assuming development takes place to meet increased passenger demand. These case scenarios are assessed as the No Development 1 Scenario and Impact 2 Scenario explained above.

Low Case Forecasts

The low case forecast analysis shows the existing terminal reaching its capacity in 2007 based on an annual rate of growth of 3% for domestic traffic, 2% for international scheduled and 4% charter services generating 1.2 mppa. Any expansion in demand will be met at competing airports and operators will be unable to expand service provision at DTVA.

High Case Forecast

This assumes the full implementation of the terminal and associated works together with the airports marketing strategy generating more ATMs to accommodate demand. Domestic scheduled services are assumed to grow at 4% per annum with additional or larger aircraft being based at DTVA. Additional growth will be as a result of increased load factors (passengers) and frequency. Much of this growth is projected to be in the low cost carriers (LCCs) where it is estimated that each additional aircraft based at the airport could generate 250,000 passengers per annum and LCC growth in the first 5 years could be up to 25% and similar growth rates have been recorded at other locations. Charter services are estimated to grow at 6% pa based on an additional aircraft and more destinations being served with additional capacity from other operators and specialist carriers.

Passenger Air Transport Movement (ATM) Forecast

Based on observed trends, aircraft capacity and load factors; Low and High forecast figures have been produced for all passenger ATMs.

Low case suggests ATMs will grow at 6% pa until 2007 reaching 12,569 movements. This assumes present aircraft size will remain unchanged as operators will not invest in the DTVA routes. High Case assumes a gradual increase in aircraft capacity and a growth of 3.5 % pa average and that growth will slow after the first 5 years in addition ATMs will be affected by a change in the type of aircraft used particularly on the international charter services. The projection at 2015 is 28,366.

Cargo Forecasts

Freight volumes in the north east are low accounting for only 0.1% of total freight flown from the UK. DTVA does not at present have fully equipped services for freight and the proposed development, it is expected, will generate additional business activity. Without the additional floorspace and apron areas growth will not continue beyond 2007. This results in some 916 ATMs. Freight volume is expected to grow from 7,672 tonnes (low case projection) to 25,785 tonnes (high case projection) by 2015, based on runway capacity and the availability of a 24 hour operation. This will equate to 0.75% of total UK freight and be characterised by the use of Boeing 737 type aircraft and a proportion of freight carried on scheduled flights. This projection

will result in an increase in freight ATMs from 916 in 2007 (low case projection) to 2,395 by 2015 (high case projection).

General Aviation (GA) Forecasts

It is estimated GA will grow at around 2.7-2.9% pa and comprise flying clubs, local movements and military flights. There is however, likely to be a falling off of military activity as a result in the restructuring of the armed forces. The Low forecast is estimated at 47,575 movements for GA and an increase in the High forecast to 58,707.

Total Movements

In the Low case scenario movements stagnate because capacity is reached in 2007 at 61,062 movements. In the High case scenario this increases at 2015 to 89,467.

Day and Night time Aircraft Movement Forecast

The ES further splits the ATM projections by day and night time movement, night-time being defined as 2300-0700 hrs. This split is based on current trends in movements and growth in traffic for charter scheduled and freight operations. The latter suggesting an equal split of day/night movements. The majority of general aviation movements are during the day.

The forecast split is:

	Total Day Time Movements	Total Night Time Movements
Low Case (2007)	58,157	2,905
High Case (2015)	83,119	6,348

These projections underpin the remainder of the work carried out in the ES. The figures have been derived from established sources of data and are based on recent trends in the aviation industry and the potential growth of DTVA, they are therefore accepted for the purposes of the EA as an appropriate basis to assess and determine the planning application and development impacts.

Aviation Hazard

Synopsis of EA Information

This section of the ES deals with the risk of accidents involving aircraft. The ES makes the point that if the risk associated with Impact scenario 2 (worst case scenario) is deemed to be acceptable, then it would also be acceptable for the other lesser scenarios.

Results are presented in the form of contour maps of individual risk, that is, the annual probability of an unprotected individual in a particular location being killed as a result of aircraft impact. The data assessed and presented in the ES is derived from predicted aircraft movements and assessed relative to criteria set out by the Department for Transport and the Health and Safety Executive.

The overall approach is a method developed by the UK National Air Traffic Services (NATS) and is based on:

- The airport layout and traffic
- Predicted crash frequencies
- Determination of crash locations locally

- Assessing consequences of crash impact
- Generating risk results
- Assessment of risks

The ES illustrates the information by producing contours of individual risk, the probability, per annum, of a person at a given location being killed by an aircraft impact, around the airport area.

Crash frequency is analysed using data collected from 1979-1997 included in a NATS report, this is broken down into aircraft types and groups with a historical crash rate per million movements being generated. These are then assessed based on types of crash and proportion i.e. 20% take off crashes from flight, 8% from take off over runs, 52% landing crashes from flight and 20% landing over runs (for aircraft over 4 tonnes, a different modelling method is used for smaller aircraft).

The ES then comments on the ground destruction model used by NATS and identifies the only hazardous installation close to the airport as the Elementis Chromium works to the north east of the airport.

The baseline year for the risk analysis is 2003 to the projection date of 2015.

Annual aircraft movement is summarised as follows for the stated scenarios:

- Baseline (2003) 51,868 movements
- No Development 2 (Capacity being reached at 2007) 64,961 movements
- Impact 2 (2015) 93,367

Clearly not all the movements are passenger jets and the ES then breaks these movements down into detailed aircraft class types as per the NATS data.

The ES then sets out the individual risk (IR) assessment methodology and establishes the contours of risk relative to the main runway around the airport. It also describes the statistical probability of fatalities per year from other events such as being knocked down or struck by lightning in order to put risk predictions into a context.

Public Safety Zones (PSZ) and Industrial Risk Criteria

The ES comments that guidance was issued in 2002 concerning the control of development around airports. In short within PSZ planning permission should not generally be granted for any development which results in a significant increase in the number of people living or working in those areas and in some restricted circumstances residences should be bought out by airport operators. In addition the ES measures the element of risk based on the approach of the HSE and the perception of risk as well as the actual risks, these are summarised as *unacceptable risk*, unacceptable except in extreme circumstances e.g. war, *tolerable risk* where the risk is tolerated to secure benefits and *broadly acceptable risk* regarded by most as insignificant.

Baseline Assessment

The ES concludes, that in respect of the Department for Transport criteria no one is exposed to a risk of 1 in 10,000 per annum. The lower 1 in 100,000 risk contour lies within the presently defined Public Safety Zone (PSZ). With respect to the HSE criteria all residents are presently exposed to a broadly acceptable standard of risk.

No Development Scenario 2

No one is exposed to a risk as high as 1 in 10,000 per year. That is, there are no properties the airport is obliged to offer to purchase. The lower 1 in 100,000 risk contour extends beyond the currently defined PSZ. If the PSZ were then to be recalculated it would expand and new development would be restricted within it. However, such a PSZ extension would not take in any existing areas that are presently densely developed. Residents of Urray Nook are exposed to a level of risk on the HSE criteria which is borderline broadly acceptable and tolerable, all other being broadly acceptable.

Assessment of Development Impacts

The ES sets out the combined impacts of the new development and the south side development as the worst case risk scenario based on the DfT and HSE criteria.

The ES concludes the greatest level of individual risk at a residential location occurs in Urray Nook and is 1 in 717,000 per annum.

With respect to the DfT criteria no one is exposed to a risk of higher than 1 in 10,000pa, that is, there are no properties the airport is obliged to offer to purchase. The lower 1 in 100,000 risk contour extends beyond the currently defined PSZ. If the PSZ were then to be recalculated it would expand and new development would be restricted within it. However, such a PSZ extension would not take in any existing areas that are presently densely developed. Residents of Urray Nook and Middleton St George are exposed to a level of risk on the HSE criteria which is borderline between broadly acceptable and tolerable, all other residents being exposed to risks being broadly acceptable.

The ES concludes the risks to hazardous installations, Elementis Chromium and plant on Teesside as low to insignificant and that risk to individuals from aircraft impact is below 1 in 100,000 in all residential locations. The existing PSZ at the north east end of the runway extends to 2.1 km from the threshold of the runway. A revised PSZ contour based on the increased risk would stretch to 3 km but this will not impact on any area which is currently significantly developed and no properties would fall within the extended zone within which the airport would be obliged to offer to purchase.

Whilst there are some uncertainties in all predictive tools the ES concludes even considering these calculations for error, the broad conclusions of the ES are unchanged.

The ES concludes that in the case of DTVA there is a low probability of damage caused by vortex currents from aircraft even with increased levels of traffic because of the small number of houses in the area and their remoteness from the runway centre line. Any incidence of vortex damage can be dealt with by an insurance scheme or works to affected properties but there is no history of such damage in respect of property adjacent to DTVA.

Mitigation and Residual Impacts

Under the Impact 2 scenario risks are found to be tolerable by HSE criteria i.e. the risks are acceptable to secure the benefits. The approach adopted at present is to minimise risk by adopting all measures reasonably practical such as the variation of arrival and departure routes over heavily populated areas and the maintenance of appropriate PSZ.

It is concluded on the basis of the above assessment that the development does not pose a significant threat to public safety in respect of aviation hazards.

Noise

Synopsis of EA Information

This section of the ES considers the impact of the proposed developments in terms of:

- Airborne noise (see attached aircraft noise contour maps at appendix D)
- Ground operations
- Road traffic noise
- Construction Noise
- Noise from terminal and associated developments
- Impacts and proposed mitigation

In setting out the methodology the ES states that noise is assessed mainly with respect to its effect on local people. In general it states the importance of changes in noise levels relates to the relative increase and this is summarised as:

- Increase of 0-2 (dB) imperceptible changes with no impact
- Increase of 3-5 (dB) perceptible changes and marginal impact
- Increase of 6-9 (dB) up to a halving or doubling of loudness and significant impact

Airborne Aircraft Noise

The main noise sources are planes taking off to the point on the departure track where noise reduces and landing and the use of reverse thrust brake mechanisms. For the purposes of the ES noise is measured in absolute terms and is calculated on the basis that there will be no change to the runway length, no major change in the type of aircraft using the airport, no change in routing of aircraft and the increase in movements of 70% until the planning horizon of 2015.

Impact assessment criteria are derived from PPG24 (Planning and Noise) and assessment techniques used in studies of other UK airports.

Day time noise should be taken into account where for a 16 hour daytime period where the following thresholds apply:

- 57 dB for the onset of low community annoyance
- 63 dB for moderate community annoyance
- 69 dB for high community annoyance

For night time noise assessment is made over an 8 hour period measure in 48dB and 55 dB supplemented by the use of a 90 dB SEL contouring. SEL relates to Sound Exposure Level which is the measure of noise from a single event which takes account of duration as well as intensity.

Predictions are presented in the ES in the form of noise contours for a 16 hour period during the day and 8 hour period during the night along with SEL footprints for night time movements.

Those contours presented in the ES are based on accepted practice and reflect current operations at the airport and whilst data is accurate for more modern aircraft some assumptions have been made in respect of some older aircraft still operating out of DTVA.

The ES then goes on to describe the impact of the proposed development in respect of the four development scenarios. This includes an assessment of the two noisiest aircraft currently using the airport, the MD83 and Boeing 737-800. Future noise levels are based on summer traffic

movements, being the busiest and, therefore potentially noisiest period and some conclusions from the planning inquiry into the South Side Development have been included in the current ES.

The Impact scenario 2 (completion of all development) assumes the use of the Boeing 767-200 the largest passenger aircraft used at the airport and the Boeing 747 (SEL footprint) although it was accepted that the aircraft more likely to be used in respect of cargo is the 767 or 737 given the length of the runway.

Night-time impact is dealt with as a separate issue in presenting the assessments.

Impacts are expressed by the numbers of properties falling within the existing and predicted contours based on the OS map for the area, they are therefore approximate but presented as reasonably accurate given the low density of the development in the area.

It has been assessed that the St George Hotel and MSG Hospital on the airport site fall outside of the noise contours for all scenarios.

The following is a summary of noise contours and numbers of dwellings affected.

Scenario	Number of Dwellings in Contour (Approximate)			
	Daytime dB Contours (16hr)			Night-time (8hr)
	>69	63-69	57-63	>55
Baseline	0	0	21	0
No Development 1	0	1	24	0
No Development 2	0	4	29	13
Impact 1	0	4	39	2
Impact 2	0	6	45	21

Baseline Conditions (Day time aircraft noise)

The ES illustrates the day and night time noise contours as a result of current airport activity including the 90 db SEL for night time impacts. The high community annoyance contour (69dB) is largely contained within the airport boundary and contains no residential properties. The moderate community annoyance contour (63dB) extends to Low Dinsdale (south west) but does not contain any residential properties. The low community annoyance contour (57db) extends to the area of Neasham Hill (south west) in the Low Dinsdale area, and Eastgate Farm (north east) and contains approximately 20 dwellings.

The assessment has been supplemented by an analysis of complaints from the public and it is noted that most relate to movements of military aircraft, light aircraft and training flights with only a few relating to commercial, passenger aircraft movements.

No Development 1 (Day time aircraft noise)

The high community annoyance contour (69dB) is largely contained within the airport boundary and contains no residential properties. The moderate community annoyance contour (63dB) extends to Low Dinsdale (south east) which contains one additional property. The onset of low community annoyance contour (57dB) extends to the area of Coatham Stobb (north east) and Pettals Wood (south east) exposing 24 properties similar to under existing conditions.

No Development 2 (Day time aircraft noise)

This contour is somewhat larger because of the assumption that South Side Development will potentially utilise Boeing 747 aircraft. Even with this assumption the population exposed to greater than 57dB is small as the contour is largely over agricultural ground.

The high community annoyance contour (69dB) extends from the A67 extends to the north east/south west over land with no residential properties. The moderate annoyance contour (63dB) extends from east of Eastgate Farm (north east) to Black Wood (south west) 4 properties lie within this area. The onset of low community annoyance contour (57dB) extends from Coatham Stobb (north east) to Eryholme (south west) and contains an estimated 29 dwellings.

Impact 1 (Day time aircraft noise)

The high community annoyance contour (69dB) is largely within the airport boundary and contains no residential properties. The moderate annoyance contour (63dB) extends to Eastgate Farm (north east) to beyond the Teesdale Way (south west) this area contains 4 properties. The onset of low community annoyance (57dB) extends to the clay pit, Coatham Stobb (north east) to south of Eryholme. It is estimated 39 dwellings lie within this area.

Impact 2 (Day time aircraft noise)

As expected this has the most effect on the daytime noise contours because of the combined effects of the north and south side proposals. The high community annoyance contour (69dB) extends from the A67 (north east) to the River Tees (south west) but contains no properties. The moderate annoyance contour (63 dB) extends from Eastgate Farm (north east) to Black Wood (south west) with 6 properties affected. The onset of low community annoyance contour (57dB) extends from Cowley Moor Farm (north east) to Westfields (south west) towards Dalton on Tees and contains an estimated 45 dwellings.

In summary the ES points out that in respect of daytime aircraft noise, because of the nature of the area, relatively few residential properties are affected by the development scenarios. No properties under any scenario are exposed to the high community annoyance contour (69dB). Even with all developments completed only 6 properties are exposed to the moderate noise contour (63dB). For the onset of low community annoyance the contours indicate and increase from 21 properties under the baseline scenario to 45 with all proposed developments implemented.

The overall increase in noise levels assessed for three locations (Neasham Hall, Middleton One row and Eastgate Farm) are a maximum of 3-5dB for all developments.

The current level of noise associated with commercial operations at DTVA is small when compared to other airports. The low annoyance contour contains few properties (Birmingham for example affecting 14,000 houses in 1999) because of the low level and type of operations and the undeveloped nature of the area. Overall increase in aircraft noise impact will remain modest and no properties are exposed to the high annoyance contour levels.

The number of properties exposed to moderate annoyance level, assuming all development proceeds is 6, contrasted with 80,000 at Heathrow, 8,000 at Manchester 5,500 at Birmingham and 800 at Luton. The number of properties exposed to low onset annoyance levels is 50 i.e. approximately 120 people. The DfT has estimated current populations so exposed as 8,700 people for Leeds-Bradford, 2,600 at Liverpool, 43,300 at Manchester and 1,200 at Newcastle.

Night-Time Noise Impact of Aircraft Noise (Night-time)

The ES examines the issue of night time noise in respect of noise contours and individual aircraft movements. The ES states it is the 55dB contour which is assessed and used as a threshold over which some sleep disturbance might result. The baseline conditions and no development 1 scenario show that no properties are presently or predicted to be affected by the 55dB contour up to the year 2007 when the terminal will reach its operating capacity.

The effect of the application proposals will only result in 2 properties being affected by the 55 dB contour and risk of sleep disturbance. The South Side development in isolation, would affect 12 properties and the combined impact of the developments would affect 21 properties.

The 48dB contour is that threshold where the night noise level is at the onset of any sleep effects.

Without the South Side development relatively few properties are affected because of the rural nature of the area. The combined impacts of both developments sees the 48dB contour affecting suburbs of Hartburn and Egglecliffe, greatly increasing the number of people at or above the level of the onset of sleep effects. Properties within the airport boundary (St George Hotel and Hospital) also fall within this contour but the ES predicts no significant noise impacts.

Night-Time Noise – Aircraft Footprints

The ES illustrates the 90dB SEL footprints for typical aircraft using DTVA including the Boeing 737-800, 767-200 and 747-400 and McDonnell Douglas (MD83). At the 90dB SEL the plans illustrate that certain dwellings will be at a slight risk of sleep disturbance from current or future movements with or without the developments.

The ES illustrates the impact by an assessment of two of the most common used aircraft in night time activities, presently the MD83 and in the future the Boeing 737-800.

The MD83 track assumes arrival from the east and departure to the west. No properties are impacted by the 90 dB SEL contour but properties to the west in Middleton St George and the southwest are affected on departure. The Boeing 737 track assumes the same route. The 90dB SEL contour impacts only on one property, West Brocks Farm, again on departure properties are affected to the south west but the noise footprint is smaller than the MD83 reflecting the type of aircraft and engines used.

A further assessment is made on the projected use of the Boeing 767-200 for the same track. Again only two isolated properties are affected by the arrival contour and again some properties to the south west are affected but the contour is smaller than that for the MD83.

Finally, a similar track is assessed for the Boeing 747-400 a plane associated with the South Side Development. The departure noise footprint from this aircraft is considerably larger but still exposes relatively few properties, the arrival contour impacts on the Hartburn area to the north east. It is noted in the ES that the Inspector in the planning inquiry noted that the use of 747's was unlikely and in the event impacted on relatively few properties and the use of 767's or 737's was more likely. For easterly operations the impact on departure will be on lightly populated areas to the north east and Elton and Egglecliffe.

Guidance in PPG 24 (Planning and Noise) states that in an area affected by noise of the level of 90 dB SEL several times an hour, new housing should only be permitted with an appropriate level of protection against noise impacts. Case law suggests that several times in any hour requires at least three movements per hour.

The scenario with the greatest impact is the combined effects of both developments (Impact 2) which has a forecast of weekly traffic of just under 150 movements, including movements by general aviation aircraft e.g. small planes. The airport states that it is many of the smaller planes that cause complaints. This equates to 20 movements per night and because of prevailing weather conditions these will all tend to be in one direction for a single night time period with approximately 12 departures and 8 arrivals. The most movements will then be 12 at a round 1.5 per hour of all aircraft types. It is therefore concluded, that it is unlikely that locations will be exposed regularly to the 90 SEL several times in one night. For the worst case scenario in respect of the movements of 747's this equates to under three movements per night i.e. 25 movements per week split over 5 nights again it is unlikely that locations will be exposed regularly to the 90 SEL several times in one night.

The ES concludes on the issue that current operations result in a small amount of night time noise by commercial traffic because of the level of activity, operational procedures and quieter types of aircraft used and the rural nature of the area. The predicted impact of night operations is small.

The future night time noise has been assessed on the basis on continued growth. With the application proposals alone the increase in noise affects relatively few properties with only two being at risk of sleep disturbance. With the South Side development, the worst case scenario and the use of the Boeing 747 a considerable number of dwellings will be exposed to the onset of sleep effects, a smaller number would be affected by the use of smaller aircraft. The small number of properties affected could be protected if necessary.

Impact from other flying activities has been assessed including helicopters and military movements and small executive jets etc. Growth in these areas is likely to continue but will not lead to any further impacts not already considered under the general noise evaluation exercise.

The ES points out that DTVA is identified in the Transport White Paper as a site for expansion because relatively few people will be affected by growth. There will be increases in noise exposure but no one is exposed to high annoyance levels and relatively few to moderate annoyance levels or levels with a slight risk of sleep disturbance.

Mitigation

As part of a mitigation strategy DTVA will put in place appropriate controls to limit noise at the airport in line with UK practice and implement a Sound Insulation Grants Scheme (SIGs) for the affected properties.

The ES then goes on to consider:

- Noise from Ground Operations
- Road Traffic Noise and
- Construction Noise

Ground Operations

This includes an assessment of;

- Taxiing and manoeuvring
- Engine running
- Auxiliary power units (APU's)

- Engine maintenance (thrust)
- Reverse thrust braking

The impact of noise for the above has been assessed for a number of identified locations around the airport based on published criteria and methodology in PPG 24 (Noise) for day and night time periods as for aircraft noise. The ES uses as a measure the WHO figure of 55dB for exposed noise levels that cause no general community annoyance. The ES assumes a 8dB reduction per doubling of distance from noise sources to the measuring points and the ES does not include the reduction that will result from screening by new buildings.

The general conclusion is that there will be slight increase in ground noise levels of around 1dB without any new development located on different parts of the airport. The South Side development will increase this by 2dB at most locations and 3-4dB in an area near the cargo apron on the proposed south side. The application proposal will increase ground noise by 1dB and such noise increase are usually described as imperceptible. The combined impact of both developments will be to increase ground noise by generally around 3dB although at locations near the cargo apron on the proposed South Side this will be 4-5dB.

Daytime noise levels with both the proposed South Side and Airport expansion in place are predicted not to exceed 50dB in most locations and will not rise above 55dB except at the St George Hotel . The hotel will benefit from screening from the proposed and existing buildings on the airport and as a result this increase is likely to be less than predicted.

Night time noise for the period 2300-0700 will increase by 2dB with no development.

With the implementation of the approved South Side Development the increases due to the development vary significantly due to the proximity of the location to the new cargo apron which forms part of the approved South Side Development. For a number of locations imperceptible increases 1 or 2 dB are predicted, for others a perceptible change of 4 or 5 dB is predicted. The greatest increases are predicted at locations near the cargo apron where clearly perceptible increases of 6 and 8dB respectively are predicted.

With the implementation of the proposed development, but not the South Side Development, the increases are 2 or 3 dB at each location due to the development. Such small increases are at the limit of perceptibility.

With both developments implemented the increases in levels of night-time ground noise around the airport due to the developments are generally 3 to 5 dB corresponding to perceptible increase with the potential for marginal impacts. At locations the majority of which are due to the South Side Development, higher increases of 6, 7 and 8 dB respectively are predicted.

The proposed development will have a small impact on ground noise levels, generally less than the approved but not implemented South Side Development. The combined effect of both developments equate to perceptible increases at most locations however the resulting levels are generally modest and do not indicate significant impact.

Ground running of engines is controlled by the airport under current regulations. Recent ground tests have averaged one a month for the last year. No complaints have been received as a result of these tests except one case involving a military aircraft running an engine for 30 minutes. Future testing will be required after maintenance but this will be on a location on the airfield

some distance from the nearest sensitive receptor. The ES concludes noise from such tests will be audible but not at a level to be problematic.

Road Traffic Noise

The assessment of road traffic noise is based on the use of the existing road network since no new roads are required to support the development. The ES concludes that traffic will increase as a result of the development but only by 1dB defined as an insignificant increase and this in turn will mean no significant impact in terms of vibration.

Noise from Construction Operations

It is concluded that construction works on the various parts of the site will impact on the nearest sensitive receptors. However, the noise level will not exceed the commonly used 75dB noise limit. The developer will, however, minimise impact by the use of specified construction techniques and site management.

In so far as the operation of parts of the developments themselves are concerned e.g. car parks, cargo area etc. the EA concludes there are no activities that will impact significantly on the nearest sensitive receptors.

The Noise section of the ES has been assessed by officers in the Public Protection Division and their broad conclusions are as follows.

Airborne Aircraft Noise

The consultants have used a number of assessment criteria to consider the impact of aircraft noise arising from the airport under each of the four scenarios mentioned above. These are based on the noise exposure categories (NEC) specified in Planning Policy Guidance PPG24 "Planning and Noise" and assessment methods used at other UK airports.

At present the consultants' modelling shows there are no houses around DTVA within the moderate or high community annoyance daytime contours and 21 houses within the low community annoyance daytime contour; these properties being situated in and around the Low Dinsdale area. In the 'worse case' Impact 2 scenario, 6 houses would fall within the moderate annoyance daytime contour and an estimated 45 houses (around 120 people) within the low annoyance daytime contour. This is similar to the situation with the airport expansion but without the Southside Development – 'Impact 1 scenario' - where 4 houses would fall within the moderate annoyance contour and an estimated 39 houses within the low annoyance contour. The consultants have provided figures for comparison with other airports, to show that more than 95,000 people fall within the moderate or high contours around Heathrow, 9000 at Manchester and 1500 at Leeds/Bradford.

No houses are currently situated within any of the above night time noise contours. In the 'worse case' impact 2 scenario 21 houses would fall within the >55dB night-time contour for the onset of risk of sleep disturbance whilst the lower 48dB contour would encompass a wide area including parts of Hartburn, Eaglescliffe as well as St George's Hotel and MSG hospital. The consultants have, however pointed out that the previously approved Southside Development is mainly responsible for night-time noise as only 2 houses would fall within the >55dB night time contour if the airport expansion were take place without the Southside Development.

With regards to the >90dB SEL (Single Event Level) contour, the modelling shows that some existing night time aircraft such as the MD83 impact on parts of Middleton One Row and Dinsdale on departure. The consultants have also provided footprints for two aircraft likely to operate at night in the future regardless of whether the proposed development is approved (B737-800, similar to the B737-300 which currently flies at night; and the B767-200 which is one of the larger charter aircraft likely to be introduced) – these have similar footprints to the MD83 although they have a slightly smaller area of impact. The largest noise footprint would occur as a result of B747 movements which are only likely to operate as part of the approved Southside development. These would elongate the impact areas significantly in both takeoff and departure directions, although there would appear to be little effect on housing within Darlington Council's area. It was also established at the Southside Inquiry that B747 movements would be unrealistic and that smaller aircraft such as B767 or B737 would be involved in any freight movements at night.

The Government recognises that noise from airport activities (particularly night flying) is likely to have the greatest environmental impact on surrounding neighbourhoods, but has made clear that this will have to be balanced against other benefits that airports bring. 'The Future of Air Transport' White Paper states:

"The Government recognises that noise from aircraft operations at night is widely regarded as the least acceptable aspect of aircraft operations. We will bear down on night noise accordingly, but we must strike a fair balance between local disturbance, the limits of social acceptability and the economic benefits of night flights. This should be done on a case-by-case basis."

The consultants' noise predictions show that the overall impact of the proposed airport expansion would be relatively low when compared with other UK airports. Nevertheless for the individuals who are affected by the expansion plans there would clearly be a significant change over the current situation and a likely reduction in residential amenity associated with living near a busy international airport. It must also be remembered that the parameters which have been correctly used by the consultants for daytime noise levels, represent the combined effect on aircraft movements operating over a full 16-hour period and tend to disguise the fact that people living within a reasonable distance of the airport would notice a significant increase in the number of fly-overs (between 60,000 to 90,000 in 2015 as opposed to around 52,000 in 2003). In addition, individual reaction to noise varies considerably and airport studies have shown that even at the 'low' annoyance level 29% of respondents were moderately or very annoyed and a further 25% were a little annoyed (i.e. less than half of the respondents were not affected by noise at this level).

The consultants have pointed out that DTVA has an advantage over some other airports in that there is "unrestricted night flying" and predicts that with both developments there would be around 150 aircraft movements per week (currently around 52 per week). A limited restriction was imposed as part of the Southside approval, but I would strongly recommend that the issue of night flying be reconsidered as soon as possible with a view to agreeing a tighter restriction with the applicant and that any agreement should include the installation of noise tracking systems by no later than 2015.

I would also recommend that the applicant be asked to consider implementing their proposed Sound Insulation Scheme at the lowest possible noise level. PPG24 states that NEC B is the level at which noise should be taken into account when determining planning application and, where appropriate that conditions should be imposed to ensure an adequate level of protection

from noise. This equates to the lower 48dB night noise contour and it is therefore my opinion that this should be the trigger for sound insulation at DTVA. This contour is also very similar to the SEL footprint for the B747 which, if used at night as suggested, gives further justification for setting the threshold at this level. In 1990, however the Government adopted 57dB LAeq,8h as the trigger for sound insulation at Stansted airport (possibly due to the number of properties around that airport which would have been included if the lower threshold were used?) and the applicant may argue that this is the value which should be adopted. In practice the consultants have not predicted the number of properties affected at this level and the applicant may propose the more conservative 55dB contour which would offer protection to the 21 worst-affected houses but still significantly less than the number contained within the 48dB contour. It should also be remembered that sound insulation would do little to safeguard the residential amenity of gardens and other outdoor areas and that at least 45 houses would be experiencing outdoor noise levels above those which the World Health Organisation consider would cause "serious annoyance".

Noise from Aircraft Ground Operations

The consultants have carried out noise calculations for various ground based activities at 10 receptor locations around the airport to determine whether they would adversely affect the properties in those areas.

At present the consultants calculations show that there is only one location where the noise levels exceed the 55dB LAeq daytime level – St George's Hotel – although all of the calculations ignore barrier effects and it is likely that this will be an over-prediction due to the screening effect of the intervening terminal building (this could have been confirmed by the consultants using on-site noise readings). In the 'worse case' impact 2 scenario, two locations – St George's Hotel and Middleton-St-George Hospital – are predicted to be exposed to daytime noise levels above 55dB, although again both developments are screened by intervening buildings and are likely to experience much lower noise levels in practice.

The same situation applies to night time noise levels with St George's Hotel predicted to be exposed to noise above the 45dB LAeq level under the baseline scenario and St George's Hotel and Middleton-St-George hospital being exposed to noise above that level under the impact 2 scenario (without screening). All remaining properties are expected to be exposed to levels below 45dB LAeq under all four scenarios.

Most properties are, however, predicted to experience some increase in overall noise levels - generally up to +5dB increases in daytime noise levels ('marginal' impact) although at Featherstone House, close to the main runway, up to +6dB increase is predicted ('significant' impact). Night time noise level increases are expected to be higher with up to +10dB increase predicted at Featherstone House.

Little information is provided in the environmental statement to show the methodology used in the ground noise assessments and as such it is difficult to determine if the conclusions reached are reasonable. Additional information has been requested from the consultant; however it is clear that all of the considered noise sources are likely to increase in proportion to the number of aircraft using the airport. Of most concern is the proposed new aircraft stands, which would be directly in line with Oaktree housing estate without the benefit of screening by the terminal building (as currently) and engine maintenance testing, although if the consultants calculations are correct properties in the affected areas would not be exposed to levels above the accepted criteria.

Most properties would, however, experience increases in noise levels and it should be remembered that the criteria are generally based on absolute levels averaged over periods of 16 hours, daytime and 8 hours, night time with no reference to how these relate to existing background noise levels (which are likely to be low at night in many areas around the airport) and that short-term peak noise levels could be much higher. The only information provided for peak noise levels relate to engine testing where maximum levels of 60dBA are predicted (presumably at the nearest property – i.e. Featherstone House at 750m from the anticipated test site, although this is not stated). I would recommend that a condition be attached to any planning approval restricting engine testing to 0700-2300 hours (winter) and 0600-2200 hours (summer).

Road Traffic Noise

The level at which sound insulation grants are provided for new road schemes is currently 68 dB LA10,18h and many of the predicted road traffic noise levels are above this threshold, even under baseline conditions. In reality, however there are very few properties within 10m of the road other than at Long Newton and Eaglescliffe and, as such the predicted noise levels are likely to be higher than in practice. Within the boundaries of Darlington BC, the nearest property to the airport access road is around 20 metres distance (Oaktree Farmhouse) and the majority of houses are at least 55 metres distance. The theoretical reduction in noise levels at these distances is around –3dB and –7dB respectively, reducing the ‘impact 2’ levels to around 66dB and 62dB LA10,18h respectively (i.e. well below the qualifying level for sound insulation grants for new road schemes). The impact on properties at Long Newton is likely to be reduced by the proposed Long Newton Interchange which should remove traffic from the vicinity of the houses.

No attempt has been made by the consultants, however, to consider the impact on properties in terms of PPG24. Whilst this guidance is intended to consider the introduction of new housing into the vicinity of transport related noise sources, it is nevertheless useful in determining the impact of transport developments on existing housing. The LA10,18h is approximately equivalent to the LAeq,16h – 2dB which would place Oaktree Farmhouse marginally into NEC C and the remaining properties into NEC B. Some protection may be provided by the buildings proposed as part of the North Side Business Park, should that development be granted planning permission, but in any event they do not form a continuous barrier and the proposed ‘acoustic mound’ would provide little protection from road traffic noise at bedroom level. I would therefore recommend that consideration be given to requiring a barrier in the form of mounding and/or close-boarded fencing along the airport access road to protect the housing from road traffic noise.

Subsequently, discussions were held between the applicant, its noise consultants and officers within the Public Protection Division; agreement has been reached in respect of both the methodology used by the applicant in its assessment of noise and (in view of that assessment) of the level of mitigation which it would be appropriate and reasonable to require is put in place (as to which see further below).

Mitigation of Noise Impacts

Officers from both Councils have agreed an appropriate mitigation strategy for the airport which, in summary, will include the following measures:

- to prepare a Construction Management Plan to reduce the impact of construction activities;
- to set up a quarterly Noise Monitoring Sub Committee (to include EHOs from the local councils as well as other representatives) to monitor their Quiet Operations Policy and to

nominate a senior manager with responsibility for this area who will, amongst other things produce an Annual Noise Report;

- to set up a Noise Monitoring System comprising two fixed noise monitoring terminals at locations agreed with ourselves and Stockton BC at either end of the runway and, from time to time a single mobile noise monitoring terminal, to check actual noise levels from departing and arriving aircraft;
- to introduce a Sound Insulation Grant Scheme (SIGS) to provide sound insulation to any properties within the 63dB LAeq,16 hour daytime and 55db LAeq,8 hour night time contours;
- to prohibit the takeoff or landing of noisier QC8 and QC16 aircraft between the hours of 2300-0700;
- to maintain a public complaints handling service to investigate each complaint and report the findings to the EHO with a summary to be included in the Annual Report.

Quota Count (QC) Controls

Members will be aware that there are at present no controls on flying activities at the airport. The ES and the applicant recognise that some controls are required in order to mitigate the impact of night arrivals and departures in particular even though the study demonstrates that relatively few properties are potentially affected by high levels of noise. This is partly achieved through other regulations but is, in part, achieved by what is termed the *quota count* system. That is, the airport will benefit from an annual account measured in points. Each aircraft movement occurring during the night-time period will result in deduction from that account of a certain number of points, this is the QC (Quota Count) value. The QC is based on the type of aircraft and the older and potentially noisier the aircraft the greater the value of the deduction. At present no QC system applies to the Airport.

A QC budget of 20,000 points was allocated to the South Side proposal by the First Secretary of State as part of the approval of that development. The applicants have agreed to use a similar count value for the new terminal development. The agreed account will cover not just the South Side development but also the existing and proposed activity at the airport. This represents a net reduction in the approved South Side QC count budget as the quota count will be divided between the proposed developments not increased.

In view of the above comments the view is taken that, whilst the proposed development will impact on residential properties in the locality, this impact is limited to relatively few properties and for the most part does not achieve noise levels that will result in the highest noise levels and community annoyance. Given the level of mitigation that will be achieved through controls in the proposed Section 106 Agreement relating to noise monitoring, a proposed sound insulation grants scheme (SIGS) and night time traffic control and practical developments on the site, the proposed development is consistent with national planning policy as set out in PPG24 (Planning and Noise) and planning policies E48(Noise Generating/Polluting Development) E49(Noise Sensitive Development) and H15(The Amenity of Residential Areas) of the BDLP and policy ENV29 of the TVSP.

Air Quality

Synopsis of EA Information

This section of the ES considers the impact of the development on air quality from construction work and the operation of the airport, again the horizon for this assessment is 2015. Pollution is assessed against the Governments air quality standards and targets. The ES points out that Government guidance suggests airports need only be assessed for two regulated pollutants,

nitrogen dioxide and PM10 (particulate matter over 10 microns in size) and emissions from aircraft need only be assessed if the predicted passenger throughput is 10mppa for PM10 and 5mppa for nitrogen dioxide. Notwithstanding this the applicant considers it appropriate to account for this issue in the EA to identify impacts and measures to minimise those impacts. The focus of the assessment is on emissions from road traffic, although emissions from aircraft and other airport activities have also been taken into account.

National and local assessments have ruled out harm for a number of pollutants, the ES focuses on:

- Particulate matter of less than 10 micrometers in size (PM10)
- Nitrogen Oxides
- Nitrogen Dioxide
- Dust
- Odours

It is not possible to measure impacts in terms of global pollutants or quantify impacts on global emissions. However, the ES does identify potential measures to reduce overall emission from the operation of the airport.

The assessment of the pollution aspects of the development is carried out within the context of current Government and European policy and Regulations in respect of air quality and the objectives to reduce pollution, the methodology followed in the ES is within this current regulatory framework.

Again the ES assesses this issue in respect of the development scenarios set out namely, baseline conditions, no development 2 and impact 2. Committed developments have been included up to the year 2015 to ensure a worst case scenario is assessed. It follows that if the air quality impact for the worst case scenario is acceptable, then a lesser level of development will also be acceptable.

The air quality study area covers an area 8km by 8km between Darlington and Stockton along with parts of other districts. The assessment covers areas where aircraft will be at 100m or below and changes in local traffic flow on local roads. Within the study area 109 receptors have been modelled in what are considered to be the most sensitive locations. Data and other information is sourced from Darlington BC and Stockton BC (Environmental Health services) DTVA meteorological station and RAF Leeming. Traffic data is provided in the Transport Assessment.

Aircraft operations are assessed for each landing and take off cycle based on the type of aircraft, technical specifications, and fuel consumption and so on. Data is derived from a number of technical sources. Assessment has been limited to aircraft under 100m since it has been shown that above this height there is a negligible impact on ground concentrations. The ES considers impacts from auxiliary power units (APUs), small power units on aircraft that run on the ground to maintain power to essential aircraft systems. Potential emissions from the existing fuel farm, movement of airside vehicles, impacts from fire training on the site, car parks, road traffic emissions and stationary sources.

The ES assesses the potential pollution caused by extensive but temporary construction phases in terms of dust etc. This is difficult to quantify in absolute terms and the ES is based on experience of other sites.

Baseline

The ES states that for the purposes of the study, sensitive locations are places where the public may be regularly exposed to pollutants over periods of time, relevant to the air quality objectives, within 30m of a road or close to a junction and slow moving traffic. As stated aircraft above 100m will be of little impact but areas close to aprons and taxi ways will be affected and construction dust may impact up to 100m and odour up to 1km. The ES comments however, there are no ecological locations that would be sensitive to air quality or dust impacts in the study area.

The two principal Councils for the area have carried out air quality assessments and have not declared any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs).

Monitoring has shown that nitrogen dioxide and PM10 levels in the area are well below objective levels and there are no permanent sources of dust in the area. In terms of hydrocarbons, which are the source of odours, an assessment is made up to the planning year of 2015 but neither Council reports complaints in respect of odours from the airport in recent years. Emissions from fire training at the site are included in the baseline assessment.

No Development 2

The ES comments this is difficult to quantify because of the long time frame being considered up to 2015 but the ES considers the maximum approved development for the South Side area. The existing (2003) measured concentrations have been projected to 2015 taking into account improvements in technology. The ES concludes that EU and UK statutory objectives are expected to be achieved for nitrogen dioxide and PM10. There will not be any significant sources of dust in the future (after construction which is assumed to end in 2007).

There is likely to be some increase in terms of hydrocarbon concentrations to the nearest receptors and thus an increased risk odours will be detected, although this cannot be quantified. Current conditions have not lead to any complaints in respect of odours.

Fire training activities will reduce the burning of kerosene and increase the burning of LPG in the future and remaining on site, this has been accounted for in the ES.

In summary, concentrations of PM10 and nitrogen dioxide are currently well below air quality objectives. Total emissions for the airport will increase to 2015 for aircraft due to an increase in the numbers of aircraft but will reduce for road vehicles as a result of improvements in vehicle technology.

Construction

There will be temporary impacts from the construction activity associated with the development; this will mainly be in the form of dust and earthworks. Phasing is not known at this time but the ES assumes all construction will be carried out in one operation over a 12 month period to assess a worst case scenario. In reality the works are likely to be longer but spread over a wider area at lower intensity.

Dust and soiling may impact some 100m from the dust source, whilst PM10 and vegetation effects might occur out to 25m. There is also the potential for dust impacts on residential properties up to 50m from the adjoining access road (some 20 houses) and up to 4 experiencing increased PM 10 impacts from bund constructions. Impact would depend on the combination of dry weather and an activity producing high levels of dust and these are considered to be

infrequent. Construction traffic levels will be small relation to existing levels and further emissions marginal.

Operations

The annual mean nitrogen dioxide objectives are likely to be achieved at every modelling point by 2015, with or without development, the greatest impact is under Impact 2 scenario i.e. with the maximum approved development on the South Side. Statutory PM10 levels are likely to be achieved at every receptor with or without development. Increases in Hydrocarbon concentrations are predicted, with the greatest impacts predicted at Middleton St George hotel. Given experience at other airports this does not represent an increased risk of odours to local residents.

The growth of the airport will result in increased emissions but in the context of Borough wide emissions these would be small with limited localised impacts.

The proposed on site foul water treatment works would be unlikely to give rise to any impacts on the nearest sensitive receptors.

Mitigation

Mitigation of construction impacts from dust are required to protect residents and the operation of the airport during the construction phase and this will be achieved by:

- to prepare an Air Quality Monitoring Program and carry out nitrogen dioxide monitoring at 4 locations agreed with ourselves and Stockton using passive diffusion tubes;
- The adoption of a Construction Management Plan (CMP);
- Careful siting of construction compounds and mineral stockpiles;
- Use of water sprays;
- Compaction of earthworks;
- Speed limits for construction traffic and covering of lorries;
- Cleaning of paved areas;
- Careful maintenance and location of plant.

Mitigation of operation is achieved through current legislative controls in force to reduce emissions in the future. The ES has shown that emission levels will remain below UK and EU air quality objectives and standards. However, DTVA will continue to operate to limit emissions through use of APUs and development of sustainable transport choices to the site.

Residual Impacts

Impacts from construction will be temporary and no specific mitigation is required in respect of the operation of the site. The risk from increased odour is considered to be small.

The Council's Public Protection Division comment:

The consultants have stated that government guidance for air quality assessments only require airports to be considered if there have >5 million passengers per annum for nitrogen dioxide and >10mppa for particulate PM10 and that they have carried out an assessment for these pollutants (as well as considering dust and odour) for "completeness". The guidance also states, however:

- *That 100,000 tonnes of freight should be considered to be equivalent to 1m tpa so that by 2015, under the impact 2 scenario, the figures for DVTA would be 7.26m tpa equivalent (i.e. requiring an assessment of nitrogen dioxide) and*
- *That assessment of PM10 is required if there are receptors within 500m of the airport boundary (i.e. requiring an assessment for particulate PM10)*

Nevertheless the consultants have looked at both pollutants and considered the current national air quality objectives as well as proposed objectives which are likely to be required by 2010. They have used an advanced air quality model to consider 109 receptors within a 8km x 8km grid around the airport, but have not considered the 1-hour mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (on the basis that government guidance states that for road transport emissions, this is only necessary if the annual mean is greater than 60 micrograms per cubic metre) and they have only considered three of the scenarios (excluding the Impact 1 scenario). The modelling data has been validated against monitoring data provided by this authority and Stockton BC and the aircraft number and types have been based on information provided by SH&E Consultants.

The baseline modelling data for nitrogen dioxide indicates that only one location, next to the A66 at Sadberge, is above the annual mean objective of 40 micrograms per cubic metre. However, comparison with monitoring data suggests that the model is significantly over-predicting, possibly as a result of 'double counting' for background data, and the result at 41.8 microgram is therefore likely to be an over estimate. Under the 'worse case' impact 2 scenario there are no locations which are predicted to exceed 40 micrograms per cubic metre – highest 27.4 micrograms per cubic metre at receptor 102, Sadberge. This fall is due to the anticipated improvements in vehicle emissions by this date which is expected to off-set increase in traffic flows...

The baseline modelling data for particulate PM10 indicates that there no locations which exceed the current annual mean objective of 40 micrograms per cubic metre or the 24-hour objective of 50 micrograms per cubic metre not to be exceeded more than 35 times per year, under any of the modelled scenarios. Seven locations are, however expected to exceed the proposed 2010 annual mean objective of 20 micrograms per cubic metre and five of these are also expected to exceed the 24-hour objective of 50 micrograms per cubic metre not to be exceeded more than 7 times per year. The most affected site at 2015 under the impact 2 scenario is location 102 next to the A66 at Sadberge, indicating that the issue generally relates to road traffic emissions. The monitoring data indicates good correlation with the modelled results for particulate PM10 suggesting that this prediction is reasonable but it is known that this provisional objective is likely to be widely exceeded across the UK and it is an issue which the Government is currently considering.

Assessment of dust and odour potential (the latter based on hydrocarbon emissions) did not indicate any likely problems

It must be appreciated that air quality modelling is based on a large number of assumptions and some of the data amount to little more than guesswork – data on PM10 emissions from aircraft, for example are not available and the 'smoke number' is used as a proxy where it is available or estimates have to be made for aircraft based on comparison with similar equipment. In addition assumptions are made about what type of engines will be fitted to the predicted aircraft, how long each aircraft will operate in each 'mode' and so on. This makes it impossible to verify the consultant's calculations without repeating the assessment process (which can take several months) and therefore much of the data must be taken at face value. The results from the modelling should also be considered at best an indication of the likely situation at a future date.

The consultants findings are, however consistent with detailed air quality modelling carried out by this Division in 2002 which, although forecasting to 2010 was based on 72,000 ATMs and is therefore within the low to high case predictions used by the consultants for 2015 (although these were some slight differences in the splits between aircraft groups used in the two methods). What is also clear is that monitoring information for other airports indicates that the main impact arises not from aircraft emissions, but from traffic on the surrounding road network. DVTA benefits from having a low number of receptors in very close proximity to access routes but, nevertheless it is critical that the infrastructure is in place to encourage public transport use and discourage use of the private car. In reality it is accepted that providing good quality public transport is dependent upon having a sufficient demand, although it is disappointing that a dedicated rail link is not considered viable at this time. It is also accepted that a large majority of passengers may still prefer the convenience of using their own transport even when this infrastructure is provided, however I would recommend that the surface access strategy be considered an integral part of any planning approval to ensure that sustainable transport remains a high priority.

Construction of the proposed airport expansion and the associated infrastructure would be an extended process completed over several years. Fortunately the majority of building work would take place away from nearby housing, reducing the environmental impact on residents). The most likely source of any disturbance would be heavy traffic using the surrounding road network and noise and vibration during piling works. These impacts could be significantly reduced by careful management of the construction phases e.g. by restricting the hours of vehicle movements and by using alternatives to driven piling methods (where possible). I would recommend that it be a requirement of any planning approval for a construction management plan to be submitted and approved by the LPA to deal with the control of noise and other pollution during the construction phases.

The application offers two options in respect of foul water treatment – connection to the proposed new sewage treatment works at Middleton-One-Row (operated by NWL) or construction of a private treatment works within the airport boundaries. Although the proposed on-site location is well away from housing, it has been suggested that the decision not to contribute to the construction of the new NWL works may delay that scheme by up to 2 years. The current Middleton-One-Row works is operating beyond its design capacity and is giving rise to odour problems for residents living close by. Building a new sewage works as quickly as possible is therefore critical for reducing these odour problems as well as ensuring that new building within the Middleton-One-Row and Middleton-St-George areas is not affected by the lack of sewerage treatment capacity.

In view of the above comments the proposed development will not give rise to air quality impacts sufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission and the proposed development complies with policy H15 (The Amenity of Residential Areas) of the BDLP and policy ENV28 of the TVSP and PPS23 (Planning and Pollution Control). It is proposed that the matters of an airport surface access strategy and a construction management plan, as referred to by the Public Protection Division, be dealt with by way of a planning condition or Section 106 obligation.

The observations of the Public Protection Division in respect of the sewerage works are noted. The provision of adequate means to treat and dispose of foul water from the new development at the Airport can be dealt with by planning conditions. It is ultimately a commercial issue to be resolved between the applicants and Northumbrian Water, as to which of the options is pursued.

The existing problem of the Middleton sewage treatment works operating above capacity is a matter for NWL and this issue is being addressed separately with the Council.

Climate Change

Climate change is a matter which has been raised by some objectors. The White Paper states that the aviation sector needs to take its share of responsibility for tackling the problem of climate change and to putting the UK on a path to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by some 60% from current levels by 2050. The Government believes that the best way of ensuring this is through a well designed international emissions trading regime. It is pressing for the development and implementation, through the Civil Aviation Organisation, of such a regime. In the short term, however, the Government is seeking the inclusion of intra-EU air services in a forthcoming EU emissions trading scheme from 2008 or as soon as possible thereafter. This approach is supported by "Sustainable Aviation" of which the Airport is a signatory. The EU Environment Council has since called for a legislative proposal on tackling aviation emissions through emissions trading before the end of 2006.

The officer view is that the issue of climate change is not specific to aviation and, is being addressed by the Government on an international basis rather than in the context of the determination of individual proposals.

Geology, Hydrogeology, Ground Conditions, Drainage and Flood Risk

Synopsis

Geology and Ground Conditions

The ES baseline analysis concludes, there are no major faults or geological structures on the site or in the immediate area that restrict development. Similarly, no mining issues have been identified as a result of consultation with the Coal Authority and risk to the development from radon gas can be discounted.

In terms of the impact of the development, in the absence of detailed construction methodologies, it has been assumed that the new terminal extension will require piled foundations. The existing ground and geological conditions do not present any undue problems of the development, the land being stable and able to take proposed loadings nor will the development have any undue impact on the existing ground conditions or geological strata under the site and will not cause the sterilisation of known mineral reserves.

Hydrogeology

The ES baseline analysis concludes that there are no issues raised in respect of protections or impact on existing hydrogeological status. The Environment Agency has confirmed that the airport is not close to or within any currently defined Groundwater Protection Zones. The ES concludes that in terms of impact, the proposed development will not present any risk of ground contamination as a result of the construction techniques used to build the development. There will be a risk of contamination from surface water run-off and this will be dealt with by the use of suspended solids tanks or similar construction mitigation measures. The development does not present, the ES concludes, any risk to contamination of the ground resource.

Drainage and Flood Risk (Surface and Foul Water Disposal)

Baseline Conditions

The ES sets out the situation on the site and in the locality in terms of existing water courses and the main river Tees. It goes on to assess the existing surface water and foul water drainage to the site.

Northumbrian Water has confirmed that whilst there are local surface water sewers in the area, they do not have the capacity to accept any discharges from the development site. NWL also comment on their concerns that existing foul drainage capacity in the village is already operating at or over capacity and that any new development will require the construction of a new works and that NWL are preparing a planning application for the new treatment works.

The indicative flood plain maps for the area show the site is not included in the flood plain, therefore the risk of the development site flooding is categorised as little to no risk. There will however, be a requirement to attenuate the flow of any surface water run off from the development site so as not to contribute to increased flood risk in the flood and river catchment areas in the wider locality and this will be dealt with through the engineering solution for the drainage system for the site.

In terms of impacts the ES draws the following conclusions.

Drainage

From the work done so far it is possible to assess the likely drainage strategy for the overall site and including the approved South Side development.

The surface water drainage strategy for the site is set out in the ES. This strategy is designed to restrict flows to “greenfield” run off rates, the system will be able to function on a gravity basis given the topography of the land and will incorporate over sized pipe storage facilities. The primary sewer will run east to west along the north side of the runway and the system will incorporate oil interceptors to filter the water run off which will feed into the new main sewer run. The ES confirms the Environment Agencies requirement for restriction of flows can be met.

Drainage will be provided in a joint trench to minimise construction costs and ground disturbance and impacts on the local environment and it is concluded that there will be no significant environmental impact from the installation of the proposed drainage system. The developer will give consideration to the adoption of “sustainable drainage” strategies on the site (SUDS) such as swales, permeable paving etc but these will need to be the subject of detailed assessment and design.

There are outstanding issues in respect of foul drainage for the site. These can be resolved through detailed design secured by an appropriate planning condition.

Surface water run-off from the new apron and taxiway, which at times can be contaminated by de-icant used on aircraft in winter months and in addition, the foul water from the airport terminal and business park which will be discharged to the south west to a proposed new works. The cargo village would have its own self contained water treatment facility.

Two options are presented in the ES as to the overall strategy for foul water disposal, either, the construction of a new works by NWL off site or, a new plant within the airport boundary to the western boundary of the site. The latter option has been identified in principle on the site and would be designed so as to present no significant visual or amenity impacts.

The ES concludes that there will be no significant environmental impacts from the drainage strategy identified for surface or foul drainage.

Flood Risk

The key risk identified is the impact of surface water flowing into existing watercourses/flood risk areas. This risk is assessed in terms of two issues; the need to limit surface water run off from the site and to deal with any situation of abnormal rainfall that might breach the capacity of on site storage. The design of the system makes neither scenario likely.

Impacts from the construction of the drainage system are concluded to be marginal and transient. The construction phase which will also be covered by a construction management plan. There will be no residual impacts in terms of drainage.

Mitigation

Mitigation will be satisfactorily achieved by the use of planning conditions and the planning conditions suggested by the EA are acceptable.

The officer view is the proposal complies with policy E24 (Conservation of Land and Other Resources) E28 (Surface Water and Development) E47 (Contaminated and Unstable Land and Development) T52 (Drainage Infrastructure) and T53 (Sewage Treatment Works) of the BDLP and ENV23 and ENV16 of the TVSP and PPG25 (Development and Flood Risk)

Landscape and Visual

Synopsis of EA Information

The section of the ES assesses the visual impact of the development on the locality. The study makes an assessment of the airport and the surrounding area identifying key features and land marks, land form and the current impact of the airport in visual terms. The ES then identifies those receptors in the area which are most sensitive to, and likely to be affected by, change as a result of the development based on each of the development scenarios. The ES states that mitigation of visual impacts is achieved by the careful design of landscape and other elements to eliminate or minimise visual impacts; a *landscape master plan* is submitted to illustrate that approach along with other elements such as the design statement.

In assessing the impact of the development the ES fully explains, as in other sections, the detailed methodology use in carrying out the study. In summary this involves a survey of the existing landscape resource and visual resource to define the landscape character and specific elements and definition of what is termed the visual envelope around the site. This informs the baseline assessment and when taken with the proposed development this leads to the identification of a *Zone of Influence*. The ES then assesses the developments impact on the landscape and appearance of the locality.

Baseline

The ES sets out a detailed analysis of the geographic location of the site and the surrounding area, it sets out the character of the locality in detail. The ES comments on local planning policy in Darlington and the surrounding districts in respect of the Tees valley. It then sets out in some detail a serial vision analysis of the area and describes routes to the airport and key characteristics of those routes and key features. The ES then defines the visual envelope.

Impacts

No Development 1

This will result in little impact; there would be no significant growth at the airport and only “ad hoc” changes to the built form and routine maintenance. Some recently planted landscaping will mature and alter some views into and out of the site but essentially the airport fabric would continue to age and decline.

No Development 2

The ES acknowledges that the development of the South Side proposals will have a significant impact on the appearance and character of the southern side of the airport complex. This has already been assessed in the EA submitted and considered as part of the original application.

The proposed South Side development would result in the removal of what is described as an area of dereliction and replacement with significant buildings which will have an impact, but that impact will be mitigated over time by proposed extensive planting around the site that will become part of the landscape of the area. Although an approved scheme, the ES points out that it should be considered as part of the cumulative effect of the total developments proposed or approved on the site. The ES in support of the current application goes on to explain the impact of the south side development and its impacts on the locality and the defined *Zone of Influence* identified under the present ES.

Impact 1 and 2

The ES then considers the impact of the development proposed and the mitigation measures built into the scheme applied for and the cumulative impact of the completion of all development up to 2015.

A detailed analysis of the *Landscape Master Plan* is submitted as part of the application, the design of which is deliberately sets out to achieve the maximum mitigation of the whole development and to soften views of what is presently described in visual terms, as a relatively denuded and functional airport. In addition the key strategy is to provide a landscape setting for the proposed development whilst at the same time landscaping those sensitive boundaries e.g. Oak Tree Estate, to effectively screen the development from view. Similarly, the lighting scheme for the whole site is designed to balance safe illumination levels which are required, whilst minimising, through the design and specification of the lights, any impacts on the nearest sensitive receptors and light spillage and sky glow from the development.

The worst case scenario is Impact 2 and the ES concludes that the developments will have a major impact on the setting and character of the airport. Views to the airport will increase from around 2km to 5km although most of this impact is as result of the approved south side development. But the main impacts will be from viewpoints close to the boundary of the airport and elevated land surrounding the site, the area around the River Tees for example will be little affected. The net effect of the South Side development is to reduce the Zone of Influence of the new proposals because the approved development will screen views into the new development area.

The ES concludes that landscape and visual impacts, although extensive, will rise above *medium* impact levels only in respect of a few receptors. Where this occurs, for example along the northern boundary of the Cargo Village, specific mitigation in the form of structural tree planting has been incorporated into the design.

In terms of impacts on landscape character these will be low to medium impacts from the proposed airport development. Visual impacts will be of a similar magnitude, with most of the significant impacts arising when the approved South Side development is taken into account.

The proposal is considered consistent with policy E4 (New Buildings in the Countryside) E9 (Protection of Parklands) E10 (Protection of Kew Townscape and Landscape Features) E11 (Conservation of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows) E12 (Trees and Development) E14 (Landscaping of Development) E29 (The Setting of New Development) of the BDLP and ENV16 and ENV17 of the TVSP.

Cultural Heritage

Synopsis of EA Information

This section of the ES deals with the impact of the development in terms of; listed buildings, archaeology, buildings of local interest, conservation areas and historic parks, gardens and battlefields.

Baseline

The application site comprises the former RAF Middleton St George now in use as a civilian regional airport. There has been the subject of limited redevelopment and is in an area which is predominantly rural in character.

There is evidence of a small amount of prehistoric activity, up to the late 1st century AD, this manifests itself in small bronze age axes and field systems but the potential for archaeological deposits existing in the application development area is low and only of local interest.

The Romans conquered the area in c71 AD, evidence exists of a Roman road to the west of the site and several Roman finds have been made in the area. The evidence suggests a small amount of Roman activity in the vicinity of the development area but the potential for archaeological remains from the Roman period existing in the development area is low and only of local interest.

The area began to take its village form in the early Medieval period (early 5th to mid 11th century) and local churches within the vicinity of the site have possible links to these settlements but the potential for archaeological remains from the early Medieval period existing in the development area is low and only of local interest.

The Medieval period (AD 1066-AD 1540) brought change to the area with a motte and bailey at Tower Hill to guard Pountney's Bridge. Local settlement patterns e.g. Neasham, were developed by landowners who built manor houses. The settlements were predominantly rural and based on agricultural activity. The potential for archaeological remains from the Medieval period existing in the development area is low and only of local interest.

Throughout the post Medieval period (AD 1540-AD1821) the area remained agricultural with a decrease in population, many of the large halls in the area dating from this time but the potential for archaeological remains from the post Medieval period existing in the development area is low and only of local interest.

Industrialisation (AD1821-1914) saw the introduction of railways to the area and an iron works, the finding of a sulphur spring in the late 18th century also saw tourists and health visitors and the development of private hospitals. The area, however, remained predominantly agricultural and the potential for archaeological remains from the industrial period existing in the development area is low and only of local interest.

During the Modern period the most change occurred with the development of the aerodrome between 1939 and 1941 being one of the most northerly bomber stations operated by the RAF and RCAF, the station was subsequently used for fighter and navigation training and remodelled in the 1950s as a fighter station. The site was sold in 1963 and converted to a civil airport. Much of the development site will have been disturbed during engineering operations and the de-mining of the station. The potential for archaeological remains from the modern period existing in the development area is low and only of local interest.

Baseline (Archaeology)

The ES considers each part of the development proposed and concludes on the evidence available it is concluded the archaeological potential of the site is low. There are no known archaeological sites within the development sites and any that did exist are likely to have been heavily disturbed by previous construction and engineering operations. A number of RAF and WW II buildings exist in the airport area and to the south of the main runway but non are listed and many are run down or have been altered or used for other purposes. Those building closest to the development site comprise hangars, the control tower and other RAF buildings. None are directly affected by the application proposals and the group context for the buildings will remain within the existing modern civil use of the airport.

There are four Grade II listed buildings within a 2km radius of the development site along with the main Conservation Area in Middleton St George. One of the buildings is screened by the natural topography of the land but three are assessed for the purposes on development impacts, they are; Middleton Hall Nursing Home, St Georges Church and Featherstone House.

Assessment of Development Impacts

The development of the terminal extension and associated taxiways etc are to take place on land already heavily disturbed from previous engineering operations, the ES concludes the impact of the development, without mitigation on the archaeological resource is minimal.

In terms of impact on the built heritage resource the ES concludes that the development will not directly impact on buildings of local interest within or outside the development site boundary, indeed there will be slight beneficial impacts to the settings of some buildings as a result of better designed buildings, landscaping etc.

In terms of impacts on Listed Buildings the ES assesses the impact on the three building identified above. The ES concludes given their location the development will have no direct impact on the settings of the buildings. The Conservation Area in the village of Middleton St George to the west is unaffected directly by the proposal because of the physical separation of the site and the topography of the land.

The ES concludes on the three remaining listed buildings:

Middleton Hall Nursing Home – lies some 300m to the north-west boundary of the site. The building will not be affected directly by the proposals and any impact on the setting of the

building, the parkland, is considered moderate and can be mitigated. The Landscape Master Plan proposes structural planting along the western boundary of the Airport which will reinforce the sense of enclosure and safeguard the setting of Middleton Hall.

St Georges Church – This building lies to the south of the airport complex. Its setting will not be compromised by the development proposal directly although there will be views to the roofs of new buildings from the northern boundary of the church grounds. Views from the church are already compromised by the existing airport but the church is screened by heavy planting and an existing barn. The impact of the application proposals will be further reduced by the development proposed on the south side of the runway.

Featherstone Hall – lies 1km from the southern development boundary. The development proposed will not impact directly on the setting of the hall which is already compromised by the existing airport. The impact of the application proposals will be further reduced by the development proposed on the south side of the runway.

The ES concludes there will only be limited impacts in terms of the heritage resource.

The ES then goes on to consider the impact of construction on Cultural Heritage. It concludes provided that no new land is taken as part of the construction process the impact of construction will only be on land previously disturbed. Construction traffic will be routed via a construction management plan.

Mitigation

Mitigation of the impact is proposed as follows:

- Archaeological investigation of all green field sites over 1 hectare in area.
- Staged programme of archaeological investigation on parts of the site not previously the subject of detailed investigation.
- Careful design of buildings and landscaping which will produce beneficial impacts.

Provided the mitigation measures are in place the ES concludes there will be no residual impacts from the development of any significance.

The ES concludes that, with staged archaeological works, complimentary scaling and massing of buildings and landscaping, landscaping and screening to protect the closest listed building and formulation of a Construction Management Plan, the impact of the development will be low.

The ES has been considered by the Council's archaeological advisors who agree with the conclusions of the assessment, namely that development will not impact on the archaeological resource and that on this particular application no planning conditions are required. English Heritage agree with this approach and conclusions. The proposed development raises no issues with regard to policy E34 (Archaeological Sites Of Local Importance) and ENV10 of the TVSP or PPG16 (Archaeology and Planning) and PPG15 (Planning and The Historic Environment)

Ecology

Synopsis of EA Information

This section of the ES deals with the impacts of the proposed development on the ecology of the locality including plant and animal life and local habitats. The ES sets out the survey

methodologies used in preparing this section of the submission and how impacts are quantified and evaluated.

Baseline

A Phase 1 habitat survey was carried out and revealed the following habitats:

- Unimproved grassland
- Improved grassland
- Arable
- Hedgerows
- Scrub and tall herbs and
- Water courses and associated vegetation.

Surveys were also carried out in respect of birds, amphibians, reptiles, invertebrates, badgers, and bats.

In addition to the filed surveys, existing records for amphibians and reptiles, birds, mammals, plants, invertebrates and Sites of Conservation Importance were collated by reference to the relevant organisations and consultees.

Some of the work was desk based and some carried out by survey of the sites.

Evaluation of Existing Habitats

The ES sets out an assessment for each habitat area as follows.

Unimproved Grassland (Medium to High Value) - As result of management practices at the airport there exists a diverse and extensive area of unimproved grassland which is recognised as being of nature conservation importance, much of the similar land outside the airport boundary being lost to agricultural uses. The grassland has no conservation designation but is of value because of its scarcity and extent. The ES outlines that habitat loss of species rich grassland can be partially mitigated for thorough habitat creation and management, predominantly through the translocation and reinstatement of areas of herb rich turf. Although it is not possible to fully mitigate for the loss of unimproved grasslands, mitigation will reduce the overall loss of this habitat.

Other Grassland (Low Value) - Other grassland within the site consists of coarse grassland which has lower floristic diversity but may support a higher number of invertebrates. The unmanaged and semi-improved grassland is of value only in respect of its scale at the parish and neighbourhood level and is assessed as being of low importance for nature conservation.

Hedgerows and Ditches (Low Value) – All hedgerows on the site have been planted relatively recently and are species poor being dominated by hawthorn. They would not be classed as “*important*” by definitions in the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 but do provide some continuity around the site, habitat for birds and mammals and commuting and foraging routes for bats.

The hedgerow along Aislaby Lane is more species rich and could be classified as *important* under the Hedgerow Regulations.

Scrub and Scattered Trees (Low Value) – The area of scrub within the development site is comparatively low but it does contribute to the diversity of the area.

Amphibians (Low Value) – There are no water bodies within the study area for development. It is accepted that some amphibians which breed in ponds outside the area could use parts of the site as a foraging area although bearing in mind the nature of the habitats and the physical barriers to movement, such as the A67 and the railway line, it is considered unlikely that any of the development areas are used by amphibians. Given the distances involved and the physical barriers to movement it is not expected the development will impact on newt presence in the area.

Reptiles (Low Value) – No reptiles were observed during the preparation of the ES although it is accepted that potentially suitable habitats exist. However, these are limited and it is not expected the development will have any impact on reptiles in the development area.

Birds (Low Value) – The ES concludes that whilst there are some species of birds in the development area which are recognised as being in decline and rare/threatened species, this does not imply the birds are rare, and indeed can be common, but they are identified because of their relative decline since the 1970's mainly as a result of changed agricultural practices. Four species of birds are listed as being of high conservation concern and eight being of medium concern.

Based on the study assessment the study area as a whole is rated of being of low importance in terms of birds but because of the predominantly arable nature of the land surrounding the site it may be rated as medium.

Bats (Low Value) – Although most of the airport has a periphery of hedges and trees with a value for foraging bats, most of the site is exposed and unsuitable for the species. Overall the airport is rated as being of low importance for bats and is unlikely to support directly any significant populations.

Invertebrates (Low Value) – Two specific areas on the airport have been identified as being of interest but most of this is outside the boundary of the current planning application.

Assessment of Development Impacts

Baseline Projection

Whilst there would be some changes to the ecology of the area these would be as a result of natural succession and the continuing management of the site. These changes are dependant on the degree of human intervention.

No Development 2

This will result in the loss of some of the identified wildlife areas on the south side. This scheme has already been the subject of a separate EA. The grassland areas within the remaining area of the airport would continue to be managed under the airports grassland management plan and natural succession would be limited to the peripheral areas of the site within the application site boundary.

Impact 1

This assessment scenario addresses the impact of the proposed development in isolation assuming the South Side development has not been built. This means that the extent of semi-natural habitat at the start of construction would be about 90Ha more than in the Impact 2 scenario, which is described below and represents a worst case scenario. Hence although the nature of the ecological impacts and the total land-take for the application development would be

the same in both scenarios (Impact 1 and Impact 2) the loss of semi-natural habitat would be less under Impact 1 when expressed as a percentage of the total area of habitat.

Impact 2

This represents the worst case scenario in that the all the committed and applied for development is completed up to 2015.

The ES necessarily draws a distinction between *direct* and *indirect* impacts and those impacts that might be *short or long term permanent or temporary* and a judgment of scale etc. Similarly, it is usual to assess the impact of development on the basis of total land required during construction that leads to a loss of habitat on a permanent or temporary basis. The assessment of the residual impacts informing mitigation measures such as reinstatement of habitats.

In terms of the terminal extension and apron areas some of this will be development on existing developed land and will not result in the loss or direct impact on habitats and species.

The cargo facility and associated development along with apron extensions and new taxiways will result in the permanent loss of unimproved grassland. This equates to 13 hectares of unimproved good quality grassland or 20% of the unimproved grassland in the application site boundary. With a further 3 ha (8%) being lost to extended taxiways. This is assessed as a negative impact given the importance of the land to the county and whilst the remaining grassland would provide the same habitat quality, in the absence of mitigation; this is assessed as an impact of moderate to major significance. Mitigation is proposed in the form of a translocation of grassland and reinstatement after construction which will reduce this impact.

Impact during construction will result in the temporary loss of some land to drainage works and this may persist for some years after reinstatement. The new sewerage treatment works, if constructed within the boundary will result in the loss of some land but ecological impacts are marginal. The connecting drain run to the proposed new works to the west will impact on the species rich hedgerow on Aislaby Lane and re routing of that run will need to be considered in the final design solution for drainage. The impact of the required drainage works in ecological terms is assessed as *low*, any unavoidable impacts being mitigated in the final designs. The loss of the land to any new works would be permanent.

There would be some impact on bird populations including the loss of 3% of the 6.1km of hedgerow in the development boundary. There is also likely to be some disturbance to other bird locations but the nature of the airport and its surroundings are no conducive to supporting large populations particularly around the runways etc. There is therefore likely to be little if any displacement of territories as a result of the development and all construction will avoid disturbance to nesting areas and times.

No ponds will be lost as a direct result of the development and for reasons of distance, physical barriers and environmental conditions there is no impact on species associated with the nearest ponds to the site. Similarly, it is concluded the impact on invertebrates will be of minor significance.

None of the buildings affected have the potential for bat roosts and hedges use as commuting on foraging routes will be retained. Open areas on the airport are poor foraging areas for bats because of lack of echo location features and so there will be no impact on bats in these areas.

There is no impact on badgers, otters or water voles which are not present on the site in any event and no direct impact on any statutory or non statutory site of nature conservation importance.

In-direct impacts as a result of construction will include additional noise, dust and general activity but since this will mostly be near the airport complex disturbance will be minimal and temporary in nature. Ground water pollution will be dealt with by appropriate drainage safeguards as set out in the drainage strategy and dust will be controlled to avoid any risk to the airport itself.

Safeguarding policies at the airport will be retained to deal with bird populations and the risk of bird strike. The impact of additional emissions from the expansion of the airport on the ecology of the area is negligible locally. De-iceants used on aircraft will be dealt with through the improved drainage services at the site and present no pollution risk to the ecology of the area. There is not likely to be any significant change in indigenous bird populations to the area as a result of the growth of the airport and other species such as bats will benefit from additional planting etc in the area.

Mitigation

The ES sets out those measures that mitigate the impact of the development, these may be summarised as follows:

- Clearance of vegetation outside breeding season;
- Protection of retained habitats during construction;
- Control of the routing of construction vehicles;
- Assessment of any sensitive locations unavoidably lost;
- Retention and management of hedgerows;
- New landscape planting;
- Reinstatement of unimproved grassland lost temporarily during construction;
- Application of protected species legislation;
- Habitat creation and re-instatement;
- Pre construction survey of identified sensitive locations for recording and assessment.

The mitigation strategy will require post development monitoring and assessment and the ES suggest three year assessments and full botanical surveys at year 2 and 6 years interval after that.

Residual Impacts

The development will result in the loss of 16 ha of unimproved grassland which is of county significance but this will be reduced to 9 hectares as a result of the mitigation strategy. This is assessed as a moderate impact as a result of the development and the ES notes that much of the grassland will be retained on the site and managed as present. After mitigation approximately 9% of the unimproved grassland within the site will be permanently lost. This is considered to be of moderate significance.

This section of the ES has been examined by the Councils Countryside Team and Natural England. Whilst no objection to the proposed development is raised by the countryside officers, Natural England and Durham Wildlife Trust submitted a letter of objection in the first instance, objecting to the loss of the unimproved grassland and commenting on additional survey work that they felt was required in respect of some species.

The additional work survey work required by Natural England has been carried out by the applicants and this has been assessed. On the basis of the additional information and the mitigation strategy set out in the ES, Natural England has confirmed it has no objection to planning permission being granted subject to planning conditions.

The officer assessment is that the proposed development is consistent with policy E23 (Nature and Development) of the BDLP and ENV6, ENV7, ENV8 of the TVSP and PPG9 (Nature Conservation) and that the mitigation strategy suggests an appropriate method of replacing lost environments and limiting the permanent impacts on others areas.

Construction Impacts

Synopsis of EA Information

This section of the ES deals with the impacts from the construction process itself rather than the expanded airport. They are considered to be temporary in nature but cannot be accurately assessed at this time because of the nature of the application. However, the ES submission is based on previous experience of similar projects completed by the applicants. The DTVA will continue to operate during the building process and so there is an operational imperative to keep disturbance to a minimum.

The timing of the construction of each of the elements of the scheme is a matter closely linked to market demand which is difficult to predict, so the ES presents the worst case scenario that all elements would be constructed simultaneously. The ES comments on noise and vibration from construction and traffic, construction traffic impacts, land take for construction, impact in terms of noise, dust and vibration and disturbance to ecology and impacts from drainage engineering works. Although outline in nature it has been possible to assess issues such as noise and air quality. The key sensitive receptors are those residential properties nearest the site and ecological receptors and water resources. Any identified impacts will be dealt with by a construction management plan (CMP) to be agreed with the Council before the commencement of works.

Different parts of the project are likely to take different lengths of time, from 6 months to 15 months for the main terminal building.

The following assumptions have been made based on experience:

- An average of 50 HGVs per day and maximum of 100 per day delivering materials;
- No significant export of soil from the site;
- The use of driven piles for foundations;
- Careful location of contractors compounds;
- Delivery of large pre cast sections;
- Delivery of granular material and concrete.

Traffic impacts are assessed to be marginal, even at peak periods, the traffic being readily absorbed onto the existing road network. Construction debris from the site on the highway will be dealt with by road sweeping or other methods agreed in the CMP. Noise will occur but will not have any significant impact, there will be some disturbance to the residents on Oak Tree

estate but access to the site will necessarily be via the new access road, impacts can be mitigated by restricting hours of working.

Similarly, noise from construction processes will impact on some local residents but will be tolerable and controllable via the CMP and working practices.

Impact on air quality may result from dust and airborne particles and some pollution will inevitably occur along with dust settlement. The impact from dust is dependent on local weather conditions but any impacts will be mitigated through the CMP via prevention measures.

Construction costs are estimated at £56m creating the equivalent of 60 full time jobs.

The CMP (Construction Management Plan) is the main method of mitigating the impact of the construction phase. This will deal with matters such as:

- Working hours;
- Routes for construction traffic;
- Dust control measures;
- Wheel washing facilities;
- Location of compounds and storage areas;
- Construction of physical barriers to the site to mitigate impacts;
- Liaison with local residents and procedure for dealing with complaints.

Whilst there is inevitably likely to be some form of disturbance caused by the construction of the proposed development these impacts will be mitigated through the application of a Construction Management Plan which the applicants have indicated would form part of the proposed S106 Agreement.

Construction impacts are, by their nature, temporary, although given the scale of the development the building process could be phased over different lengths of time with varying degrees of impact. Nevertheless a refusal of planning permission on the basis of construction impacts is not appropriate and the view is taken that on site management controls will significantly reduce the impacts of any construction process. No issues are raised in respect of policies E48 (Noise Generating/Polluting Development) E49 (Noise Sensitive Development) and H15 (The Amenity of Residential Areas) of the BDLP and policy ENV28 of the TVSP and PPS23 (Planning and Pollution Control).

Agricultural Impacts

Synopsis of EA Information

This section of the ES assesses the impact of the development on those parts of the application site presently in agricultural use. The business park and western car park are both constructed on land presently used for agriculture.

The land affected by the developments is low grade being Sub Grade 3b. The land holding affected extends to some 105 ha of freehold and secure tenanted land at West Brocks Farm.

The impact of the development would result in the permanent loss of 14 ha of grade 3b land. The development would not adversely impact on the viability of the existing farm unit. The impact of the development in terms of agriculture would not be significant.

Mitigation is achieved by using the least amount of land required for the development and the re-use of stripped soil for landscaping of the site. The viability of the farm holding will not be affected to any significant extent.

The conclusions of the ES on this issue are accepted by officers and since the development will not result in the loss of the most versatile agricultural land the proposal does not conflict with policy E6 (Protection of Agricultural Land) of the BDLP or policy E20 of the TVSP and PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas).

Transport Assessment and Highways Impacts

Impact on the Strategic Network

The Transport Assessment submitted as part of the application has been thoroughly assessed by the Highways Agency who have responsibility for the Trunk Road network. Their conclusions are that there are no objections to the development of the airport subject to some improvements being carried out to the network. The Agency have issued a decision which takes the form of an Article 14 Direction which, requires the Council to impose specified conditions set out in the response. One of the conditions is that no part of the development is commenced until construction of the A66 Long Newton Interchange scheme has been announced by or on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. This is to ensure the extended Terminal does not come into operation until the Long Newton Interchange is complete. Other conditions relate to off-site highways improvements at the Great Burdon and Yarm Road roundabout.

Impact on the Local Network (Darlington BC/Stockton BC)

The DBC Highways Engineers comment as follows:

Both applications are addressed within the same Transport Assessment, there will be conditions that would be applied and these should therefore apply to both applications.

Of the junctions modelled the only junction that has any capacity problems would be in the morning peak hour in the year 2015 at the Mill Lane approach to the A67/Airport Access Road roundabout. The RFC for this junction is 0.96 and this is in excess of the usually acceptable value of 0.85. However, the modelling reflects a surge in demand over a 15 minute period and when flows are evened out over the morning peak hour the RFC reduces to 0.83. Therefore, in relation to impact on the local highway network there would be no highway objections raised.

Some of the conditions that would be required relate to the trunk road network and these will be outlined in a response from the Highways Agency. In summary these are as follows:

- *no development to commence until the start of the construction of the A66 Long Newton junction improvement scheme.*
- *no development shall be brought into its intended use until improvements works are agreed for Great Burdon roundabout and the A66/A67/Yarm Road roundabout (works carried out to timescales set down by the Highways Agency). Some of the works at the latter will involve works on the A67 approach road. This road is not part of the trunk road network and there would need to be a joint agreement between ourselves and the Highways Agency when the works are carried out to this roundabout.*

Though the construction of the new interchange at Long Newton will provide the main access to the Airport there will still be a significant amount of local traffic accessing the site via the A67, there is a section of this road, between the A67/Airport Access Road roundabout and the

Borough boundary, that is in poor condition and it should be made a condition of approval that improvements are carried out to this section of highway.

I understand there has been an Agreement between the Airport and the Highways Agency in relation to the alteration to signage on the trunk road network. There are signs on the local highway network that will also need to have the new name of the Airport and it should be made a condition of approval that these signs are altered/replaced.

The Transport Policy Section will be commenting in relation surface access strategy requirements and Travel Plan issues.

Provided the above are included as conditions of approval I would raise no highway objection to the proposal.

Works will be required within the public highway at accesses to North Side Business Park, the A67 between the Airport Access road roundabout/Mill Lane roundabout on the Borough Boundary, and on the A67 approach to the A67/A66/Yarm Road roundabout, I would therefore request that you include an informative with an approval as follows:

“The applicant is advised that works are required within the public highway, these would need to be the subject of an Agreement between the applicant and the Highway Authority and contact must be made with the Highways Manager (contact Mr S Brannan 01325 388755) to discuss this matter”.

So far as the trunk road network is concerned, the above comment has been superseded by subsequent discussions between the applicant and the Highways Agency, which is reflected in the Article 14 Direction. As regards the Engineer’s reference to the condition of the A67 and signage, the applicant has agreed to implement a signage strategy (to be approved by DBC) and to pay a financial contribution of £20,000 towards maintenance work on the A67 between the Airport access roundabout and DBC’s borough boundary. It is proposed that those matters will be incorporated within the Section 106 Agreement (as to which see below).

As regards the Airport Surface Access Strategy (“ASAS”) and the associated Travel Plan, they both operate under the auspices of the Airport Transport Forum (“ATF”). The applicant has indicated its commitment to continue to implement the ASAS which has already been approved by the ATF, and to implement the associated Travel Plan, an agreed form of which is to be considered by the AFT shortly. Those matters are also proposed to be incorporated within the Section 106 Agreement.

Cumulative Impacts and Impact Interactions

In accordance with EC and EIA regulations, the ES adopts an integrated approach to cumulative impacts. It is concluded no additional cumulative impacts will occur other than those set out in the ES and no significant effects arising in respect of impact interactions.

Employment Creation and Investment

The comments set out above deal with aspects of the proposed development in terms of planning policy and development control issues. Members will note the officer’s view in each of the relevant sections that the proposed development is considered acceptable and that the impacts of the development can be mitigated by the use of planning conditions or the terms of a Section 106 Agreement.

Of no less importance are the potential economic benefits of the development in terms of investment and job creation. All new development has the potential to contribute to wealth creation and employment opportunities. The employment and economic opportunities from a given development in terms of can be given appropriate weight as a material planning consideration. That weight will, in the opinion of officers, increase and reinforce a decision to grant planning permission where a proposed development complies or broadly complies with development plan policy; conversely such matters may be taken into account in decisions that are more finely balanced or conflict with development plan policy.

The application is supported by an Economic Statement in respect of both applications. The background and broad conclusions of the statement are set out in the ES and these may be summarised as follows.

Synopsis of EA Information

The background and broad conclusions of the Economic Statement are set out in the ES and these may be summarised as follows.

The role of the airport as a key economic driver is recognised in policy statements at all levels. The White Paper (Future of Air Transport) comments that airports play an important role on regional economies to;

“provide and important impetuous to regeneration and a focus for new commercial and industrial development” and “increasingly act as a focal point for clusters of business development.....attracting inward investment to the region...”

The White Paper also encourages the development of local supply chains and expansion of the aviation sector. This approach is reflected in a number of policy statements that promote regeneration and competitiveness and recognises the role of regional airports in key international investment decisions in the high technology sectors and just in time deliveries and production.

The Northern Way initiative seeks the development of transport infrastructure across the region, including aviation, as a key to delivering economic regeneration.

Regional Economic Strategy for the North East (2002) identified air transport as one of six key priorities with the aim of providing excellent air services along with the development of business “clusters” at key transport nodes such as DVTA. The updated RES (2006) also emphasises the importance of improving the Region’s connectivity with national and international destinations to ensure the North East attracts and retains businesses through ease of access to markets. It also identifies DTVA as part of the “Darlington Gateway” project which aims to take forward regeneration in Darlington.

The importance of the airport is recognised in Regional Planning Guidance and the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy and the expansion of regional airports is supported by Government through EDRF Objective Funding and Assisted Area Status which applies to much of the Tees Valley area.

At the sub regional level the role of the airport is recognised in The Tees Valley Vision a key aspect of the policy is a commitment to developing the role and contribution of the DTVA with improved surface access and expansion of services. It is recognised that the provision of new services to new destination will influence investment decisions in the future. Members will be

aware that DTVA is one of five identified development objectives priorities set out by Tees Valley Regeneration Company. As stated above both the TVSP and BDLP have planning policies that permit development at the airport which is related to the airport, aviation or is development that requires an airport location.

The impacts will be reflected in direct local impacts both on and off-site and impacts from the *multiplier* effects of development e.g. suppliers etc. These include:

- Direct on airport employment – e.g. within the airports operational area
- Direct off airport employment – e.g. airline offices hotels etc
- Indirect employment – e.g. jobs in supply chains
- Induced employment – jobs supported by the spending of those individuals employed directly or indirectly by the airport
- Catalytic Impacts – jobs supported or created by investment decisions based on the airport
- Construction Impacts – jobs in construction.

The study does recognise the possibility of some displacement effects of the proposed development that might result in jobs being moved to the airport, however in the case of aviation development this would not result in any policy conflict since the White Paper envisages growth at a number of airport locations. Similarly it is normal to assess the multiplier effects of a development that is the number of jobs created as a spin off from key investment decisions.

The ES identifies three main areas of growth:

- Residents and business in Darlington and Stockton
- The Tees Valley area
- The North East Region.

The study demonstrates through assessment of the locations of passengers and workers what area the employment impacts will cover. Data shows that 65% of all passengers in 2003 resided in the sub regional area. At the regional level this increased to 88% with 11% from outside the area, principally North Yorkshire. In terms of employment at the airport in 2004, 58% of employees came from the two local authority's areas (DBC and SBC), 73% from the sub region and 92% from the wider region. The ES estimates impact on the basis for local, sub regional (Tees Valley) and the wider (North East) region.

The ES sets the context for the economic growth which is summarised as being:

- The area is one of economic need and poor economic performance;
- GVA (Gross Value Added) per head is low relative to national and regional averages;
- Earning levels are poor;
- Rates of new business formation are low;
- A declining population;
- High levels of deprivation;
- Some local above average growth particularly in the public sector, but attraction of higher value sectors has been poor.

Key aspects of the analysis include and increased unemployment rate of 7.8% across the Tees Valley area. With a total of 8 local authorities out of 23 being ranked within the top 10% most

deprived areas across England and Wales much concentrated in the districts in the Tees Valley area.

The ES assesses the employment/economic impact of the development against the various defined scenarios. The impacts identified are qualified in terms of any displacement effects (jobs that are diverted from elsewhere) full time equivalent jobs are reported in the study and multiplier effects are assessed. The study identifies the present origins of passengers and employees at the airport and assesses future growth against baseline figures.

The ES considers the economic and regeneration policy context as well as the evidence of economic and regeneration need. In the case of DTVA this is reflected in:

- strong and explicit support for further development of DTVA in the key regional and sub regional economic strategies;
- recognition of the importance of the role of the airport in reversing long adverse economic trends and the great level of need in the sub region the airport and its immediate environs being one of the key five projects for the sub region; and
- the fact that Government policy recognises the role of regional airports as economic drivers in its policy statements.

Baseline Assessment

At present, based on a survey of the airport some 750-800 full and part-time jobs exist on site across a range of skills and services. The contribution by the airport to the local economy is estimated to be in the region of £44m in 2004 roughly 0.6% of the estimated £7.3bn GVA in the Tees Valley in 2001.

Assessment of Development Impacts

The ES considers the impact of the development in terms on increased traffic at the airport in terms of cargo and passengers.

No Development 1

This scenario would see the airport continue to expand but would reach capacity in 2007 at 1.2mppa and 8,000 tonnes of cargo.

No Development 2

This assumes the construction of the South Side development. Projections from the ES which supported that application suggested in the region of 5,000 jobs.

Development up to 2015 will result in an estimated 2,900 jobs higher than the baseline assessment of some 900, an increase of 2000. By 2015 under the development scenario DVTA is estimated to support 3,400- 3,600 jobs across the Tees Valley Sub Region an increase of some 2,300-2,500 jobs. In terms of the contribution of the airport to GVA (Gross Value Added) this is estimated to increase to something in the order of £170m from a level of £44m in 2004. An additional £56m of construction activity will generate the equivalent of 60 full time jobs. These figures exclude employment that may be generated by the South Side development.

The new jobs created are expected to be mainly full time and will be a mix of more highly skilled jobs such as flight operatives, air traffic control etc but jobs will exist in less skilled areas such a cleaning and catering for example. Encouragingly, recent surveys at Newcastle airport have shown that 20% of new jobs were taken up be people previously unemployed and the

Airport has undertaken work with existing agencies to maximise opportunities to link the development to local training and recruitment schemes to equip local people for new jobs.

In addition, the development will have further impacts in terms of:

- attracting new firms to the area and the airport directly linked to service expansion and airport functions;
- developing efficiency and competitiveness of existing firms whose investment decisions may turn on the existence of air services;
- attracting and developing the inbound tourist market particularly in respect of low cost carriers for short breaks etc.

The ES also comments that a good range of international services has been shown to be an important factor in location and investment decisions for business. In coming years the airport anticipates expansion of current services and new direct links to key city and leisure destinations such as Brussels, Paris Germany and Scandinavia, with domestic opportunities to the south. The main expansion may come from the Low Cost Carriers (LCC's) and DVTA hope to add, for example Bordeaux, Cork and Paris to the services provided, with the expansion of the EU this may provide other service development opportunities.

The ES points out the Regional Economic Strategy regards the development of "clusters" an important economic priority and this is particularly relevant to DTVA which recognises that certain economic activities rely heavily on air services. In addition, there is an opportunity to develop further the overseas tourism activity in the Tees Valley and Northern Region by the provision of direct scheduled services and the development of the tourism market and development strategies on the back of a good quality local airport.

The ES estimates the equivalent of 60 full time jobs from the construction phase of the projects.

In terms of mitigation the ES concludes that since there is no other airport in the Tees Valley area the only impact is likely to be on other regional airports such as Newcastle, reducing rates of growth there by providing services more convenient to those in the Tees Valley area.

The White Paper, however, states that demand exists for expansion at a number of regional airports. The ES concludes, in the context of the poor economic performance in the Tees Valley sub region and the clear need for additional employment and support for business competitiveness, the proposed development will have significant positive impacts.

Clearly the development proposed represents a major investment in a key economic driver within the Tees Valley area and wider region. The employment potential, if realised, is significant but of more importance are the long term advantages to the sub region and wider area of investment in a key sector of the economy. The economic benefits of the scheme comprise a weighty material consideration in the determination of this planning application.

Human Rights

Some objectors claim that the proposal conflicts with the Human Rights Act 1998. Officers have had regard to that legislation, and to the matter of human rights generally, and are satisfied that no such conflict arises.

Section 106 Agreement and Mitigation Strategy

One of the purposes of an ES is to identify those impacts that can be mitigated by changes to the design of development proposals. In other respects, the ES identifies and quantifies impacts that allow the LPA to consider the use of appropriate planning conditions to mitigate impacts. Where planning conditions are not appropriate or a degree of confidence is required in terms of the mitigation measures, the ES can form the basis of Heads of Terms of a Section 106 Agreement.

Set out below in the recommendation, in the normal manner, are a range of planning conditions that will deal with outstanding detailed planning matters. In addition the officers and applicant have discussed, in some detail, the terms of a proposed Section 106 Agreement should planning permission be granted. The Agreement would cover the following broad areas;

Noise Controls

- DTVA will nominate a senior manager to lead DTVA noise policy regularly assessing the noise policy in consultation with local Councils and the Airport Consultative Committee and service providers.
- Review of departure procedures to minimise disturbance to local residents.
- Preferred runway use to minimise disturbance.
- Introduction of two permanent noise monitoring stations and reporting of noise levels to local Councils and provision of sufficient information to relate noise events to specific aircraft movement.
- Agreement and monitoring of noise contour levels around the airport
- Introduction of SIGS (sound insulation grant system) to assist in any works to the most affected properties from noise.
- Establishment of an agreed system for monitoring and responding to complaints relating to noise.
- Submission on a three monthly basis of information relating to quota point use, details of exemptions etc.
- Encouraging the minimum use of reverse thrust mechanisms by landing aircraft and APUs (auxiliary power units) on the ground.
- Introduction of controls over night flights, with some emergency and other exceptions, between the hours of 23.30 and 05.59 and the prohibition of the movement at night of certain aircraft types.

Construction

- The adoption of a construction management plan (CMP) to limit the impact of the building operations at the site.
- The control of HGV construction traffic to prescribed routes.

Surface Access

- The provision and maintenance of dedicated facilities for bus, taxi and coach operations and associated service information.
- The introduction, on a phased basis, of car parking provision for staff and visitors, based on the growth of the airport facility.
- Provision and maintenance of secure cycle facilities and cycle routes to the airport.

- The implementation of the Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS), and associated Travel Plan, through the Airport Transport Forum and other interested bodies and to report annually of progress on the strategy.
- The implementation of a signage strategy and the payment of £20,000 as a contribution towards maintenance work on that part of the A67 between the Airport access roundabout and DBC's borough boundary.

Economic Impact

- Liaison with local employment services to publicise employment opportunities at the site.

Ecology and Landscape

- Prior to the commencement of the development to produce a Landscape and Conservation Management Plan to mitigate the loss of any habitat as a result of the development.

Air Quality

- The preparation of an Air Quality Monitoring Programme to measure annual average concentrations of specified emissions from the site and the results provided to the local Councils to form the basis of mutually agreed actions.
- The provision and maintenance of an air quality complaints handling system which will include provision of information on complaints to the local Councils.

In addition, the Agreement shall rationalise a number of obligations which are contained within a separate Section 106 Agreement date 8 July 1998 (as amended by a further Agreement dated 22 September 1999) in respect of the South Side development. Those obligations (e.g. runway usage restrictions) are replicated by many of the obligations which are proposed to be incorporated within the proposed new Agreement. Accordingly, it is considered appropriate that those obligations be absorbed within the new Agreement as part of a rationalisation of the South Side controls so as to ensure there is no unnecessary duplication of the restrictions which apply to the Airport.

SECTION 17 OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

The development proposal involves a significant expansion of the airport and the services it provides. Objections submitted in respect of the fear of increased crime and disorder are noted the application is not one which it is considered would be likely to result in increased criminal activity. At a strategic level the application proposals have been the subject of external assessment by the appropriate authorities and Government Agencies in respect of any terrorist threat. Whilst the site has, in the past, suffered incidences of crime, in particular car crime, this situation has been addressed as part of the ongoing improvement of the main terminal facilities and car parks through the provision of CCTV and other security measures. Officers of both Councils are satisfied that there is no evidence that the proposed development would give rise to any increase in crime or anti-social behaviour and the proposed development complies with policy E46 (Safety and Security) of the Borough of Darlington Local Plan.

CONCLUSION

The development represents one of the most important transport infrastructure developments in recent years in the region. It will expand and enhance the role of the airport as a key economic driver in the Tees Valley area with significant employment creation and investment implications.

The officer view is that the proposed development is consistent with planning policy at all levels.

In particular the Government's strategy for the development of regional airports, as set out in the White Paper: The Future of Air Transport (2003), clearly supports the growth of Durham Tees Valley Airport. In doing so it acknowledges that the Airport has the important advantage that very low numbers of people are affected by noise. Similarly, the proposed development is consistent with policy in the adopted development plan and the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy.

The officers have undertaken a detailed evaluation of the Environmental Assessment submitted in support of the application. The view is that the ES is a robust and detailed assessment of the likely impacts of the proposed development. The ES successfully identifies the baseline conditions and through evaluation of development scenarios has, as far as is possible, described and quantified the impacts of the proposed development. The ES has informed the general planning of the scheme and will further inform the detailed design of the buildings at the reserved matters stage.

The applicant has proposed a package of mitigation measures. Officers are satisfied that those measures are reasonable and commensurate with the likely impact of the development, and can be dealt with either by planning conditions or within the Section 106 Agreement outlined above.

The relatively poor surface access to the Airport, particularly by public transport is acknowledged but improvements have been made recently and this development will ensure a continued commitment to mechanisms, such as the airport surface access strategy, that will provide a firm basis for the examination of those issues and the setting of challenging targets for improvements.

Officers have had regard to the detailed package of documentation which has been submitted in support of this proposal, and to matters raised by third party objectors and supporters. Officers are satisfied that there are no material considerations which indicate that the application should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan which, for the reasons set out in this report, support the grant of planning permission.

As set out above the procedure for the determination of this application is slightly different since the proposals will result in trans-boundary effects covering the administrative areas of both Darlington and Stockton Borough Councils.

Officers from both Councils have worked closely on the assessment of the application, on the substantive planning policy matters and the impacts of the proposed development. The contents of this report have been fully assessed by colleagues from Stockton Borough Council and on the basis of the information provided Stockton Borough Council officers agree the proposed development complies with the relevant policies in the Stockton On Tees Local Plan and that the planning conditions and proposed terms of the Section 106 Agreement are an appropriate suite of controls to limit the impacts of the development.

RECOMMENDATION

SECTION 106 AGREEMENT

Heads of Terms

1. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN

- PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT THE SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN TO MINIMISE THE DISTURBANCE CAUSED BY THE DEVELOPMENT AND THE SUBMISSION AND AGREEMENT OF A PREFERRED ROUTE FOR CONSTRUCTION VEHICLES.

2. NOISE CONTROLS

- SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A REGIME OF NOISE CONTROLS TO INCLUDE:
- THE APPOINTMENT OF A SENIOR MANAGER TO LEAD ON NOISE CONTROL POLICY AND MANAGEMENT
- REVIEW OF DEPARTURE PROCEDURES
- PREFERRED RUNWAY OPTIONS
- NOISE MONITORING BY A NEW, AND PERMANENT NOISE MONITORING SYSTEM AND THE REPORTING OF NOISE INFORMATION TO THE LOCAL COUNCILS.
- THE INTRODUCTION OF A SOUND INSULATION GRANTS SYSTEM TO PROTECT ANY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AFFECTED BY AIRCRAFT NOISE OF AN AGREED SPECIFIED LIMIT
- THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AGREED SYSTEM FOR RECODING AND RESPONDING TO COMPLAINTS REGARDING AIRCRAFT NOISE.
- SUBJECT TO THE SAFE OPERATION OF AIRCRAFT, MEASURES TO MINIMISE THE USE OF REVERSE THRUST MECHANISMS AND THE USE OF AUXILIARY POWER UNITS FOR THE NIGHT TIME PERIOD 23.00-06.59 HOURS

NIGHT NOISE CONTROLS

- THE INTRODUCTION OF A QUOTA COUNT SYSTEM BASED ON THE UK NOTAM TO LIMIT THE NOISE EFFECTS OF THE MOVEMENT OF AIRCRAFT BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 23.30 AND 05.59
- THE ANNUAL BUDGET FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE QUOTA COUNT TO 2010 BEING 20,0000 UNLESS OTHERWISE AGREED WITH THE COUNCIL. THIS BUDGET TO BE REVIEWED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE LOCAL COUNCILS IN 2010.
- AIRCRAFT MOVEMENTS RATED AT QC8 OR QC16 SHALL BE SCHEDULED SO AS NOT THE OPERATE IN THE PERIOD 23.00-06.59 HOURS LOCAL TIME.

- THE ABOVE WILL BE SUBJECT TO AGREED EXEMPTIONS

3. LANDSCAPE AND CONSERVATION PLAN

- THE DEVELOPMENT TO BE CARRIED OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH A LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN TO BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY TO INCLUDE;
- METHOD STATEMENTS TO ENSURE NO PROTECTED SPECIES IS HARMED BY THE DEVELOPMENT AND, TO MITIGATE, THROUGH THE PROVISION OF ALTERNATIVE WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIES AND PROMOTE BIODIVERSITY IN THE AREA SUBJECT TO CAA GUIDANCE ON BIRD CONTROL.

4. AIR QUALITY

- PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AGREED PROGRAMME OF AIR QUALITY MONITORING, THEREAFTER THE AGREED MONITORING PROGRAM TO BE MAINTAINED AND THE RESULTS OF SUCH MONITORING TO BE PROVIDED TO THE LOCAL COUNCILS IN ACCORDANCE WITH A FREQUENCY TO BE AGREED.
- THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AIR QUALITY COMPLAINTS HANDLING SYSTEM.

5. SURFACE ACCESS

- THE PROVISION AND MAINTENANCE OF DEDICATED FACILITIES FOR BUS, TAXI AND COACH OPERATIONS AND ASSOCIATED SERVICE INFORMATION.
- THE INTRODUCTION, ON A PHASED BASIS, OF CAR PARKING PROVISION FOR STAFF AND VISITORS, BASED ON THE GROWTH OF THE AIRPORT FACILITY.
- PROVISION AND MAINTENANCE OF SECURE CYCLE FACILITIES AND CYCLE ROUTES TO THE AIRPORT.
- THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AIRPORT SURFACE ACCESS STRATEGY (ASAS), AND ASSOCIATED TRAVEL PLAN, THROUGH THE AIRPORT TRANSPORT FORUM AND OTHER INTERESTED BODIES AND TO REPORT ANNUALLY OF PROGRESS ON THE STRATEGY.
- THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A SIGNAGE STRATEGY TO IMPROVE VEHICULAR AND CYCLIST ACCESSIBILITY ON THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK TO/FROM THE DEVELOPMENT AND THE PAYMENT OF £20,000 AS A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS MAINTENANCE WORK ON THAT PART OF THE A67 BETWEEN THE AIRPORT ACCESS ROUNDABOUT AND DBC'S BOROUGH BOUNDARY.

6. RATIONALISATION OF EXISTING CONTROLS RELATING TO THE SOUTH SIDE DEVELOPMENT

CONDITIONS

Outline Planning Permission – Extension and refurbishment of terminal building, development of Cargo and Maintenance Village (Class B2 and B8) and construction of new sewage treatment plant and associated pipe work.

Full Planning Permission – New and expanded airside apron including lighting, extension and reconfiguration of passenger car parks including lighting, access roads and fencing; construction of aircraft stands, airside hard standing and parallel taxiway including lighting; extension and reconfiguration of airport access road, pick up and set down areas, including lighting and new bus stops and taxi stands.

(A) Scope and Limits of Planning Permission

A1 - General

- 1) The planning permission hereby granted shall not be implemented other than in general accordance with the following submitted and approved plans and contained within the Environmental Statement.

Plan 2.1 Application Boundary Plan

Plan 4.1 Airport and North Side Business Park Masterplan

Plan 4.4 Airport Car Parks Plan

Plan 4.5 Airport Masterplan – Engineering Works

Plan 4.6 Landscape Masterplan

Plan 4.7 Airport Car Parks – Lighting Plan

REASON - To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the general details submitted with the planning application and the Environmental Statement.

- 2) The uses within each area of the development hereby permitted, as shown on “Plan 4.2 – Airport and North Side Business Park Parameters Plan” (“the Parameters Plan”), shall be in accordance with the Parameters Plan. Each area of the development shall not exceed the limits set out on the Parameters Plan.

REASON - To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the general details submitted with the planning application and the Environmental Statement.

A2 - Timescales for the Commencement of the Development – Outline Permission

- 3) Approval of the details of the siting, design and external appearance of, and the means of access to, any building within any part of each area of the development together with the landscaping associated with it (“the reserved matters”) shall be obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority before that part of the development is commenced within that area. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

REASON - To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the general details submitted with the planning application and the Environmental Statement.

- 4) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of eight years from the date of this permission.

REASON - To comply with S91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 5) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 10 years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved in respect of the development, whichever is the later.

REASON - To comply with S91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

A3 - Timescale for Commencement of Development – Full Planning Permission

- 6) The development to which this condition relates, namely areas B, C and E must be commenced before the expiration of ten years from the date of this permission.

REASON - To comply with S91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

(B) Conditions Applying to the Development as a Whole

B1 - Materials

- 7) Prior to the commencement of any part of the development samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of buildings within that part of the development shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON - In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the external materials in the interests of local visual amenity.

B2 - Landscape Works

- 8) No part of the development approved shall be commenced until full details of hard and soft landscaping works for that part of the site has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved soft landscaping works shall include plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, species, plant size and proposed numbers densities where appropriate. The approved hard landscape details will include, where appropriate, proposed means of enclosure; vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas, bus shelters, signs and lighting. The approved details shall include a programme for the implementation of the landscape works. The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON - To ensure that the details of the approved landscape master plan are implemented as the development proceeds.

- 9) All new planted areas shall be implemented and subsequently maintained in accordance with a landscape maintenance schedule which shall have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON - In order that the landscape areas are maintained to an agreed standard in the interests of local visual amenity.

- 10) If, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed, seriously damaged or dies, another tree or shrub of the same size and species to that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

REASON - In order that the landscape areas are maintained to an agreed standard in the interests of local visual amenity.

B3 - Ecology

- 11) No removal of trees, hedges, scrub, tall herb vegetation or unimproved grassland shall be undertaken between March and July inclusive unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON - In the interests of mitigating the impact of the development on breeding birds.

B4 - Ground Water and Contamination

- 12) No part of the development approved by this planning permission shall be commenced until:

(i) A desk top study has been carried out for that part of the site which shall include the identification of previous site uses, potential contaminants that might reasonably be expected given those uses and other relevant information. And using this information a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors has been produced.

(ii) A site investigation has been designed for that part of the site using the information obtained from the desk top study and any diagrammatical representations (Conceptual Model). This shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on the site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable;

- A risk assessment to be undertaken to ground and surface waters associated on and off the site that may be affected, and
- Refinement of the Conceptual Model, and
- The development of a Method Statement detailing any necessary remediation requirements

(iii) Investigation of that part of the site has been undertaken in accordance with details approved in respect of the above and a risk assessment has been undertaken.

(iv) A Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements for that part of the site, including measures to minimise the impact on ground and surface waters, using the information obtained from the Site Investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on the site. All remediation works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement.

REASON - To ensure that the proposed site investigations and remediation will not cause pollution of Controlled Waters.

- 13) If, during development contamination not previously identified, is found to be present within any part of the development areas, then no further development within that part of the site (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the applicant has submitted to, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for an addendum to the Method Statement. This addendum must detail how this new source of contamination shall be dealt with. All further works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved addendum to the Method Statement.

REASON - To ensure the development complies with the approved details in the interests of protecting Controlled waters.

- 14) Upon completion of the remediation detailed in the approved Method Statement a report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority that provides verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement(s). Post remediation sampling and monitoring results shall be included in the report to demonstrate that the required remediation has been fully met. Future monitoring proposals and reporting shall also be detailed in the report.

REASON - To protect Controlled Waters by ensuring that the remediated site has been reclaimed to an appropriate standard.

- 15) Where piled foundations are proposed, development approved by this planning permission shall not be commenced unless the method of piling has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The piling shall thereafter be undertaken only in accordance with the approved details.

REASON - The site is potentially contaminated and piling could lead to contamination of groundwater in the underlying aquifer.

B5 - Drainage

- 16) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of a surface water run off limitation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the purposes of this condition the scheme shall include a programme for implementation. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved programme and details.

REASON - To prevent the increased risk of flooding.

- 17) No development shall be commenced until a scheme for the disposal and treatment of drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Environment Agency should be consulted on this scheme. Thereafter no part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until the approved scheme has been fully implemented in respect of that part of the site. The scheme shall be retained throughout the life of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON - To prevent pollution of the local water environment .

- 18) Prior to being discharged into any water course, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking areas shall be passed through appropriately designed and sized interceptors (of the storm bypass design), installed in accordance with a scheme previously submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptors.

REASON - To prevent pollution of the local water environment

B6 - Archaeology

- 19) No works in areas B or F shown on the approved Airport Parameters Plan shall be commenced until the applicant has secured the implementation of an agreed programme of archaeological works for that part of the site in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON - To safeguard any archaeological remains on those parts of the site in accordance with the information contained in the Environmental Statement.

B7 - Access Roads, Cycle Ways and Footpaths

- 20) No part of the development shall be commenced until details of all internal access roads, cycle ways and footways serving that part of the development have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. That part of the development shall not be occupied or used until the approved details are provided on the site.

REASON - Ensure safe and convenient access around the site.

- 21) No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the car parking and cycle parking required to serve that part of the development has been laid out, drained, surfaced and made available for use in accordance with details which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by local Planning Authority. Those areas shall thereafter be kept available for the parking of vehicles/cycles and shall not be used for any other purpose.

REASON - To ensure that adequate provision is made for car and cycle parking.

(C) Area A - Extension of the Terminal

C1 - Servicing

- 22) Prior to the commencement of the construction of the terminal extension, details of all areas for loading and unloading and parking of service vehicles shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be laid out and made available prior to the opening of the extension to the terminal.

REASON - To ensure safe and convenient access for deliveries and servicing.

D Areas B, C and E (Car Parks and Set Down and Pick up Areas) and new Cargo Apron and Aircraft Stands

D1 - Lighting

- 23) None of the approved external lighting within the parking areas, the new cargo apron or aircraft stands shown on the submitted approved plan (Plan 4.7) shall be installed until final details of the specification, luminance and field of illumination of all lights has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

REASON - In the interests of protecting local visual and residential amenity from the impact of the lighting scheme.

D2 - Car Park Design

- 24) Development of the new parking areas within areas B and C shall not commence until details of the layout, surfacing, including all materials and drainage of the car parks and pedestrian routes and trolley storage bays, have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON - To ensure the car parks are laid out in accordance with approved standards in the interests of pedestrian and highway safety.

E Area D Cargo and Maintenance Village**E1 Servicing Details**

- 25) Prior to the commencement of construction within area D, details shall be submitted of the layout and design of all access roads, areas for loading, unloading and parking of service vehicles, vehicle manoeuvring and car parking areas and cycle storage facilities to be made available within that area. No building or phase of development within Area D shall be brought into use until the approved works have been carried out and made available in accordance with the approved details.

REASON - To ensure adequate car parking and vehicle turning and manoeuvring space is available within the development in the interests of vehicular and pedestrian safety.

E2 - Landscaping

- 26) No development on Area D on the approved Airport Parameters Plan shall be commenced until details of the landscape works to the northern boundary of Area D have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved landscape works shall be carried out in the first planting season after the commencement of the development within Area D.

If, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting of any tree or shrub within Area D, that tree or shrub or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed, seriously damaged or dies, another tree or shrub of the same size and species to that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

REASON - To ensure appropriate visual and landscape mitigation for the proposed development as set out in the Environmental Statement.

F Area F Sewage Treatment Works

F1 - Servicing

- 27) Prior to the commencement of construction within Area F details of all areas for loading and unloading and parking of service vehicles shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be laid out and made available prior to the commissioning of the sewage treatment works within Area F.

REASON - To ensure safe and convenient access for deliveries and servicing.

Trunk Road Matters

- 28) No development hereby permitted shall commence until a date for the start of the construction of the A66 Long Newton Junction improvement scheme (as included in the Secretary of State for Transport's targeted programme of improvements) has been publicly announced by or on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport.
- 29) No development hereby permitted shall commence until full design and construction details of the required improvements to the trunk road network (A66 Great Burdon junction and A66 Morton Park junction), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. For the purposes of this condition the details are shown in outline on the drawings specified in Table 1 below incorporating the notes referred to therein and including:
- i) how the scheme interfaces with the existing highway alignment, carriageway markings and lane destinations,
 - ii) full signing and lighting details,
 - iii) confirmation of full compliance with current Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Policies (or approved relaxations/departures from standards),
 - iv) an independent Stage 2 Road Safety Audit (taking account of any Stage 1 Road Safety Audit recommendations) carried out in accordance with current Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Advice Notes.

Location	Drawing Submitted by	Title	Drawing Number	Dated
A66/A1150 Great Burdon Junction	Halcrow	Great Burdon Roundabout Illustrative Amelioration Works	CTHAAV001 – SK – 002 Rev B	19/07/2006
A66/A67/ B6280 Morton Park Junction	Halcrow	A66/A67 Yarm Roundabout Illustrative Amelioration Works	CTHAAV001 – SK – 001 Rev B	19/07/2006

- 30) With respect to the highway improvements as shown in outline on drawing number CTHAAV001 – SK – 002 Rev B:
- i) No development shall be brought into its intended use prior to the above mentioned highway improvements being agreed in detail in accordance with condition (29) above; and
 - ii) The noted highway improvements shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to (1) any part of the terminal extension hereby permitted being brought into its intended use or (2) 2015, whichever is the sooner.
- 31) With respect to the highway improvements as shown in outline on drawing number CTHAAV001 – SK – 001 Rev B:
- i) No development shall be brought into its intended use prior to the above mentioned highway improvements being agreed in detail in accordance with condition (29) above;
 - ii) The noted highway improvements shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to (1) 2015 or (2) the date which is 3-years after any part of the terminal extension hereby permitted has been brought into its intended use, whichever is the sooner.

Reason(s) for the direction given at c), d) or e) above and the period of time for a direction at d) or for any other ‘holding’ direction:

The conditions set out above are made to ensure that the A66 trunk road should continue to fulfil its purpose as part of the national system of routes for through traffic, in accordance with Section 10 (2) of the Highways Act 1980, maintaining the safety of traffic on the road.

SUGGESTED SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANTING PLANNING PERMISSION

The application proposes development which will promote the expansion and development of Durham Tees Valley Airport as a transport hub and major economic driver in the Tees Valley area. In terms of planning and related policy the application is consistent with the aims and objectives of the Aviation White Paper which sets out a strategic framework for the development of UK airport capacity. The White Paper specifically recognises that Durham Tees Valley Airport is an airport which should be considered for expansion to meet projected demand and that there are no major impediments to its future expansion.

At the regional and local level the proposed development is consistent with policy in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and the Tees Valley Structure Plan (TVSP).

The application has been the subject of an Environmental Statement (ES) under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999, this statement has been considered by both Darlington and Stockton Borough Councils. The ES is considered robust assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the local environment. It has, in particular, assessed the impact of the development proposed both individually and cumulatively with other proposed developments at the airport, across range of identified subject areas. The methodology of the ES has identified, as required, the baseline conditions at the site, described the alternative impact scenarios and proposed detailed measures to mitigate those impacts either through the use of

planning conditions or obligations to be included in a Section 106 legal agreement. The Local Planning Authorities are satisfied based on the detailed report set out above, that the proposed development generally complies with policy in the respective local plans and that the suite of measures proposed through the use of planning conditions and obligations to be included in a Section 106 legal agreement, are an appropriate way to mitigate the impacts of the development on the local environment and nearest residential properties.

The proposed development has been the subject of a Transport Assessment which has been considered by the local and trunk road authorities and subject to the carrying out of some identified off-site highway works and related obligations the Councils and the Highways Agency are satisfied the proposed development will have no unacceptable impacts on the local and trunk road network.

The proposed development raises no issues in respect of crime and disorder and it is considered that no conflict arises with the Human Rights Act.

The design of the proposed development is acceptable and will make a significant contribution to the improved appearance of the terminal building and its environs.

In granting planning permission both Councils are mindful of the fact that the application proposes a significant investment in the airport which is likely to result in major economic benefits to the airport, the economies of Darlington, Stockton, the Tees Valley area and the region generally.