

**09/00679/F – Norwich Airport**

**Additional representations received prior to 12 May, following the publication of the report to committee**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Chamber of Commerce</b>	Strongly worded support: Direct relationship between successful planning application, KLM's future in Norwich and 450 key, skilled, jobs; KLM UK Engineering are a significant driver of the local economy and highly important business for the successful future of NIA; their continued operation is fundamental to the airport's focus as a centre for economic growth; employ almost half the total number of staff in work at the airport as a whole and airport relies on them for almost 7% of its total revenue; they also support a widespread local supply chain and offer engineering apprenticeships through their nearby training school	Noted
<b>Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE)</b>	CPRE are interested in minimising the impact of development on the countryside and seek to retain the beauty, tranquillity and diversity of the countryside for future generations; recognises the role the airport plays in the County and does not wish to object to its activities. CPRE seeks to minimise its impact on the rural surroundings through its role on the NACC. Note that NACC unanimously agreed to support the current application; do not consider that the current application will make any further detriment to the wider rural tranquillity of the area but ask that residents concerns are fully addressed; CPRE support the recommended conditions being imposed and will be important to ensure that the conditions are monitored & enforced and agreements between all parties are upheld.	Noted. Conditions as recommended include provisions to ensure adequate monitoring and enforcement.
<b>Horsham &amp; Newton St Faith PC</b>	Consideration should be given to the grant of planning permission for a 6 month temporary period to monitor the actual noise levels, rather than relying on theoretical or calculated levels. If the noise levels are acceptable, permission could be extended. If not, the temporary permission could lapse or be revoked.	Due to the final outlay costs involved, it is not considered reasonable to recommend the grant of a temporary permission
<b>Mr P &amp; Mrs J Cook</b>	(A copy of a letter and an invitation to visit their property has been sent to all planning application committee members direct.) In addition, concern expressed with regard to the supplementary report that none of the	Concerns noted. The issues raised are addressed in the report, with an explanation for the approach proposed

	<p>suggested alterations made by objectors have been incorporated; the site is the same; no further mitigation measures have been proposed; testing is possible every day, with extensive hours and an upper limit on the boundary of 78, which is hardly a limit; the City Council has allowed KLM's business to grow over the last 5 years with new hangars being built but have not addressed the use of the unauthorised site; should never have happened; not appropriate for engine testing to be carried out so close to residential housing and Mr &amp; Mrs Cook intend to pursue all possible avenues to reduce this blight on the lives of so many of the airport's neighbours</p>	
<p><b>Mr &amp; Mrs Baverstock</b></p>	<p>(Representation copied to members of the planning application committee direct.)  Concerned that the County Council and the Chief Executive of Shaping Norfolk's Future place the commercial interests of KLM as a higher priority than those of local residents; inadequate mitigation proposed and the use of the unauthorised site has taken place for 5 years; relative costs of the adequate sound mitigation is small; noise level limit proposed will allow much higher noise levels where wind is stronger; no access to the monitoring data for noise levels; planning conditions propose to keep figures secret; airport's assessment of practical alternatives ignores fixed establishment costs of the project and over values the feasibility of a taller barrier; issues raised about topography have not been addressed; local planning authority and NAL have dismissed and ignored the opinions of local residents to justify the application purely on the basis of commercial necessity; proposals will result in a detriment to amenity to such an extent that it will not be possible to continue living in the property on health grounds alone and if approved, would leave no alternative than to find somewhere else to live; should City Council chose to do this, it will be exposed to a challenge under the human rights act that their actions have been illegal</p>	<p>The issues concerning mitigation were outlined in the first committee report. The requirement to provide the noise monitoring data to the local planning authority is a reasonable requirement of the condition but it would be possible for the authority to share this information. The issue of wind speed and direction is outlined in the supplementary committee report. The opinions of local residents have not been dismissed but have been used to inform a suite of conditions that seek to limit the impact of this use whilst allowing the engine testing to continue to operate. The recommended conditions are designed to ensure that the impacts experienced to date would not be made worse by the future use of the proposed site.</p>
<p><b>Norwich Airport Limited (NAL)</b></p>	<p>(Representation copied to all members of the planning applications committee direct).  Do not accept all the recommended conditions. Worked with City Council planners to try to achieve mutually acceptable conditions and</p>	<p>The agreement to conditions 1-19 is noted.   Your officers are aware that the limit proposed in</p>

	<p>have largely achieved that. Conditions 1-19 are considered acceptable. Cannot support condition 20 as currently drafted. The condition is not based on noise monitoring of the noisiest aircraft. Difficult to identify the noisiest aircraft due to lack of specific industry data on the ground running of engines. Figures have only recently been received from the aircraft manufacturers clarifying this and, using this information, the modelling undertaken by the applicants' consultants indicates that it is fair to use the noise levels relating to take-off noise to demonstrate the relativity of noise generation from different aircraft types. On this basis, the figures referred to in the report (based on the noise monitored from a F100 test) is some 6dB lower than the suggested level from a B737 (400 series) which is already tested by KLMUKE. The airport therefore asks committee to adopt a higher level of 84dB LAeq(10min) in condition 20 to reflect the noise levels produced by the B737 (400) to preserve KLMUKE's ability to continue to test the range of aircraft currently maintained. Do not want to increase the noise limit to allow noisier aircraft types to be introduced to the airport but to ensure that the existing aircraft testing can continue without a breach of the condition. Provision of list of aircraft variants tested by KLMUKE. It is NAL's intention to install the monitoring equipment as soon as possible to verify the noise generation of all tested aircraft over a period of time. This data would then be used to support a variation of condition application should it be proven that the limit in condition 20 is set too low to allow for all existing aircraft to be tested as required. NAL are confident that the higher limit of 84dB LAeq(10min) is more appropriate for the preservation of the existing business and would urge members to support NAL's position by amending condition 20 as requested.</p>	<p>condition 20 is less than that considered necessary by the airport. However, the limit proposed has been obtained following the monitoring of an engine test being carried out (as requested by members in deferring the application). The monitoring was undertaken in respect of testing taking place during the time period available and was, at the time, understood to be representative of the noisiest aircraft tested at the airport. The request to increase the limit is based on information obtained which has not been verified by monitoring on the ground and, as such, it is not considered appropriate to increase the limit at this time. However, the airport's proposed installation of the noise monitoring equipment as soon as possible would enable data from actual testing to be collated over time and this data could then inform a subsequent request to vary the condition if this is considered necessary by the airport.</p>
--	--	--