

Statement to STACC ON 25mppa+ (Generation 1) Planning Conditions

Alistair Andrew, 25 January 2017

1. Chair, at the request of STACC following the last meeting, the Airport Management Team (AMT) met with Brian Ross, Jackie Cheetham and Keith Artis to discuss the planning conditions associated with the 25mppa+ (Generation 1 or G1) permission. The Committee's secretary was also in attendance.
2. Members may recall that Brian had raised the prospect of the airport being in breach of its planning conditions attached to the 25mppa+ permission once that permission was implemented (likely later this year) owing to the non-atms or 'other movements' exceeding 10,000 pa.
3. In contrast, I had suggested to the Committee, that this was unlikely to be the case because of the way in which the current air movements are counted and split into categories, is different to that of the requirements of the conditions that will come into force. In summary, the interpretation of the conditions was the main item for the meeting.
4. It is not an understatement to say that the categorisation and definition of air movements is a complex topic; one which can occupy several hours of discussion. At its simplest, movement data originates from a code assigned to each movement on the runway. Some examples include: passenger

(charter and scheduled); cargo (charter and scheduled); repositioning flight; business / general aviation and military.

5. Beyond this, there are however different methods of reporting the data by the CAA, the airport and beyond 25mppa, for planning conditions. None of these reporting methods are the exactly the same and definitions vary in each circumstance. It is these variations that provide the background to the issue at hand.
6. I don't propose to labour on the variations or indeed the reasons for them. This is because following our discussion, it was apparent to, and agreed by all that the core issue was ultimately the total gross number of movements from the runway and the environmental impact associated with those movements.
7. That gross permitted number stands at 274,000 movements per annum in the 25mppa+ Permission. In the consideration of that Permission granted in 2008, it was the 274,000 figure that was 'tested' by STAL and judged to be acceptable by the Secretaries of State. At December 2016, the airport had 180,620 movements.

8. For clarity, the total gross movements is made up of 243,500 pax, 20,500 cargo and 10,000 'other'. It is these divisions that the G1 permission seeks to control by planning condition - as opposed to the overall gross number.
9. The 10,000 'other' condition that had brought to the attention of the Committee, contains a number of sub categories which define what comprises the 10,000 limit.
10. Amongst others, it includes a rather arbitrary category where aircraft with less than 10 seats are not counted towards the limit. The net effect is to exclude some 8000 movements a year, thus not putting the airport in breach of any (future) limit.
11. No-one is entirely sure of the provenance of this category but we are all agreed that it forms no useful measure, as it is not possible to link any environmental impact (e.g. Noise) to seat configurations - large bespoke GA aircraft can have very few seats, but a 'small' GA aircraft like an Embraer Legacy can have 13 seats for example. The two aircraft would have significantly different noise impacts.
12. This category also has no relevance to any metrics used by the CAA.

13. As a result, it is a restriction that serves little purpose and is creates confusion for the vast majority.
14. Moving forward, the 35mppa+ planning application provides the platform to both propose and assess the environmental impact of a new gross movement limit at the airport. All parties are agreed that this can then form a more simplified control mechanism for the planning authority to administer. How the gross movements are assigned across passenger cargo and GA could be left to the airport.