

Dear Sirs

Stockton Council Planning Application Ref. 15/1625/FUL

Darlington Council Planning Application Ref. 15/00677/FUL

Durham Tees Valley Airport – Construction of New Link Road between Northside & Southside & Creation of New Commercial Premises for B2/B8 Purposes, etc.

I wish to object to the basis of the above planning application.

In the Planning Statement the applicant states that the rationale for the proposals (and other full planning applications that will follow) is set out within the DTVA Master Plan. The applicant further states that the Master Plan has been subject to considerable public consultation with the local community and key stakeholders and that the Master Plan proposals have received considerable support. For those reasons the applicant asserts that the Master Plan is an important material consideration to which weight should be attached when determining this planning application (and presumably subsequent applications).

By the applicant's own admission the consultation received only 130 written responses of which 71% (93) agreed with the airport's vision and objectives – hardly a ringing endorsement when one considers there are more than 415,000 adults in the so called Tees Valley.

Numerous people have commented that they were given no notification of the consultation and would have, given the opportunity, voiced opposition to the Master Plan. However, many people have expressed a desire to use the airport if flights to popular holiday destinations were made available (contrary to Peel's misinformed statements). Consequently, as an unelected organisation Tees Valley Unlimited has no mandate from Tees Valley residents to provide funding for the proposed new link road.

I do not support many of the Master Plan proposals including:

- (i) the decision to concentrate on the two existing business routes to Amsterdam and Aberdeen and "general aviation" (rather than providing frequent flights to popular destinations at realistic prices which is what the majority of local people want and other airports seem to have no problem providing);
- (ii) the proposal to build 400 houses on airport land (as houses and airports do not mix and such housing is likely to constrain future aviation development at the airport);
- (iii) the continued reliance on public funding (Peel seems to be reluctant to make significant capital investments itself; if it truly believes in the Master Plan then surely it would be prepared to back it with its own money?).

Relying on two scheduled routes only is a huge business risk which has subsequently been borne out by the 20% fall in passenger numbers on the Aberdeen route this year following cutbacks in the oil and gas industry. If KLM decides to call it a day, it would probably be the end for the airport.

No test has been applied to demonstrate the need or demand for housing on the airport site and that any housing would not be detrimental to the airport developing aviation based growth in the future.

I also do not agree with the use of a particularly low passenger forecast (200,000 passengers in 2020, 100,000 in 2030 and 2040 and 400,000 in 2050) to shape the Master Plan, especially as the UK economy is now recovering strongly and UK airport passenger numbers are once again on the up.

One of the consequences is that there is a lack of "future proofing" in the Master Plan to cope with market changes under which significant passenger numbers return to DTVA.

The same very low forecast also appears to have been used as the basis for the road traffic and noise assessments accompanying this application which cannot be right, especially as DTVA is clearly

capable of handling at least 900,000+ passengers per annum and in the recent past had aspirations for far more.

Whilst development of the airport is to be generally welcomed, I would only support development which is aviation related, demonstrably sustainable and does not restrict future expansion of aviation activities (especially the expansion of passenger services).