

Committee Date:
09.03.2010
Target Date: 05.04.2010

BROADCLYST
(Clyst Honiton/Rockbeare)

10/0033/MFUL

Applicant: Mr Clive Coleman

Location: Exeter and Devon International Airport, Clyst Honiton

Proposal: Modification of eastern end of runway and associated change of use of adjoining farmland to enhance airport safety.

CONSULTATIONS

County Highway Authority

Does not wish to comment

Devon County Archaeology

I refer to the above application and your recent consultation. The proposed development lies in an area of archaeological potential demonstrated by prehistoric activity in the wider landscape. Groundworks for the modification of the runway, including service trenching, have the potential to expose and destroy any surviving archaeological and artefactual material associated with the known prehistoric activity in this area. As such, I would concur with the recommendations made in the final paragraph of section 3.0 the archaeological desk-based assessment South West Archaeology report 091014. For the above reason I would advise that any consent your Authority may be minded to issue should carry the PPG16 paragraph 30 condition whereby

No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority.

The development shall be carried out at all times in strict accordance with the approved scheme, or such other details as may be subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

'To ensure that an appropriate record is made of archaeological evidence that may be affected by the development'

I would envisage a suitable programme of work as taking the form of the archaeological monitoring, investigation and recording of all groundworks associated with the proposed modification. The results of this fieldwork would be presented in an appropriately detailed and illustrated report.

I will be happy to discuss this further with you, the applicant or their agent. I can provide the applicant with a Brief setting out the scope of the works required, as well as contact

details for archaeological contractors who have recently carried out similar work in Devon.

Environment Agency

No objections provided that prior to development a detailed surface water management scheme that conforms to the FRA dated Dec 2009 is submitted for approval. In addition, during construction of any approved development, the following pollution prevention measures should be adopted as appropriate.

Pumps for pumping out water from excavations should be sited well away from watercourses and surrounded by absorbent material to contain oil spillages and leaks. Silty or discoloured water from excavations should be irrigated over grassland or passed via a settlement lagoon so that gross solids are removed. This Agency must be advised if a discharge to a watercourse is proposed.

Storage of fuels for machines and pumps should be well away from any watercourses. The tanks should be bunded or surrounded by oil absorbent material, regularly replaced when contaminated, to control spillage and leakage.

This Agency must be notified immediately of any incident likely to cause pollution.

Environmental Health

Contaminated Land

I do not anticipate any contaminated land issues, but a condition should be applied to any consent in order that unexpected contamination is remediated.

Noise Assessment

I have read all the responses to the questions raised and I am satisfied that the points have been covered and at this time I feel that there are no other matters outstanding on noise issues.

Therefore I have no objections to this application.

Civil Aviation Authority

No comments currently received.

PARISH COUNCIL

Rockbeare Parish Council

I am writing as a Parish Councillor in the absence of our Parish Clerk.

1. It is our view that this proposed development is in the parish of Rockbeare NOT Clyst Honiton.

2. We need to talk further to someone with a detailed knowledge of this proposal because it appears at face value that a) this proposal moves the eastern take off turning circle circa 200 metres closer to Rockbeare Village and b) by changing the turning circle from anti - clockwise to clockwise more noise will be directed at the houses on the old A30 and Silver Lane in Rockbeare Village.

If we are correct the inference is that the noise levels to the west of Rockbeare Parish will increase. Whilst this has been quantified by Bickerdike Allen Partners we would appreciate a conversation with the authors of the report about the detail of their findings. David Miller.

Further comment received 8.2.10 from the Parish Clerk:

We are concerned primarily about the noise impact of this proposal on those who live near to the east end of the runway including Rockbeare Village. The proposed alterations are in Rockbeare Parish not Clyst Honiton Parish.

We have been in correspondence with Bickerdike Allen Partners whose noise assessment came as part of the documentation supporting the application. Hannah Jones, the Engineering Manager at the Airport, facilitated this contact, although we understand that matters have now been referred to Clive Coleman who is the Applicant.

We have two main concerns.

1 NOISE LEVELS NEAR THE EAST END OF THE RUNWAY AFTER THE EXTENSION

The proposal extends the runway by 180 metres eastwards. In practice this means that planes taking off from the east end of the runway will taxi and turn nearer to Rockbeare. In addition the new turning circle will require planes to turn clockwise the opposite direction to now, meaning that the rear of the planes will be directed north towards properties on the old A30 and then Rockbeare Village itself. Bickerdike Allen claim that this won't have much effect on the noise levels experienced at Coppice Farm their noise assessment station located adjacent to Rockbeare village only a couple of decibels in fact.

It is unclear whether this conclusion reflects the way they have calibrated their model or whether it reflects reality on the ground. Until a clearer explanation is forthcoming we remain unconvinced that the change in noise levels for taxiing and turning will not be noticeable.

2 ABSOLUTE NOISE LEVELS

In the Bickerdike Allen report Fig and Table 3.1 it is clear that the taxiing and turning noise levels at Coppice Farm, which is adjacent to Rockbeare Village, are already at, and will, after the runway extension be above noise contour 69dB described on P15 of the report as the High Annoyance contour level.

When this was raised with Bickerdike Allen we were informed that taxiing and turning noise is excluded from the air contour maps published at Figures 1,2,4 and 4 Of the report and also the airports Masterplan.

We cannot understand why this should be because it surely gives the misleading impression that Rockbeare is located outside the 57dB low annoyance contour . However it achieves this by excluding high annoyance noise levels generated by planes taxiing and turning at the east end of the runway.

Frankly this looks odd and we would like transparency about what Rockbeare residents experience now, in terms of absolute noise levels, and whether in reality this application will increase it.

We would ask East Devon District Council to help us gain this information which is important to the residents of Rockbeare parish. Until then we are unable to support this proposal.

Adjoining Parish (Clyst Honiton)

No comments received

WARD MEMBER(S)

No comments currently received

REPRESENTATIONS

Objections

1 letter has been received raising the following points:

- Airport is already too noisy
- Development is outside the existing proposed development area

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

App.No:	Proposal	Decision	Date
None			
Relevant			

PLANNING POLICIES

Government Guidance

PPG13 Transport
PPS25 Development and Flood Risk

Devon Country Structure Plan (2001-2016)

Policy TR14 – Airports

East Devon Local Plan (1995-2011)

Policy D1 – Design and Local Distinctiveness

SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Exeter and Devon International Airport is located between the villages of Clyst Honiton and Rockbeare to the east of Exeter. Providing an important link to Exeter and the greater South West, the airport currently has two runways operating 26 and 08 (one in a westerly direction, the other in an easterly) a modern terminal building and various hanger and ancillary operations.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The current application seeks permission to modify the eastern end of the runways by adding an area of “pavement before threshold”. This would have the effect of lengthening and widening the safety areas to the end of each runway, enabling the airport to meet criteria and best practice guidance issued by the Civil Aviation Authority. Coupled with the laying of an additional length of asphalt, (measuring approximately 178m) and forming the additional area of pavement, the relocation of the Instrument Landing System (ILS), localiser array and equipment shelter and the landscaping of areas around the new pavement to ensure a suitable runoff environment.

The applicants have clearly expressed that the works proposed would not result in an increase in the number of air traffic movements, the use of the airport and therefore the vehicle movements to and from the airport.

CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT

The main objective behind the proposal is to ensure future compliance with the Civil Aviation Authority’s guidance notes in respect of Runway End Safety Areas (RESAs). Although Exeter Airport currently have a dispensation to use the runway with the current safety areas, this is by no means guaranteed into the future and with the extant permission for the Clyst Honiton Bypass to the west of the runway, the current application acts as an attempt to minimise future possible constraints.

Although the applicants have confirmed that the length of the runway at 2083m is sufficient for all types of planes and the planned increase in traffic that is identified within the Masterplan, the runway modification would result in two changes to aircraft movement over the runway –

- i. The turning direction at the eastern end would be reversed to a clockwise direction on the new pavement.
- ii. The take off starting position for flights on the 26 runway would move back onto the pavement area thereby extending the length of the safety area to the west

All other landing and take off positions would remain unchanged.

Based on the above changes and coupled with the repositioning of the landing lights and the Instrument Landing System, the main issues for consideration which need to be

assessed against the improved safety provision resulting from the proposed works comprises the noise impact on surrounding properties, the visual impact on the character and appearance of the area, flooding and drainage, archaeology, ecology and air quality.

Noise impact.

Significant concerns have been raised by the Parish Council in respect of the potential for noise disturbance to both the village of Rockbeare, but also the outlying properties and farmsteads that are located between the village and the airport. Submitted with the application, a noise report sought to demonstrate that over a monitoring period of 16 hours (the appropriate time period for airport noise monitoring) the increase in noise at the nearest properties would only result in a predicted 3 decibel increase (maximum) over the actual measurements taken in 2006/7 for the Airport Masterplan.

In considering the submitted information the Council's Environmental Health team, have been in discussion with the CAA who have confirmed that they have no jurisdiction over noise emissions from aircraft in flight – only the specific aircraft type has noise measurements taken during manufacture. It therefore remains the remit of this Council to control noise where possible and in this instance through the planning process. While the predictions made in the submitted report would at face value be acceptable, little information accompanied the report to demonstrate how these were derived. In assessing the information, therefore additional details and clarification on a number of issues were sought by the Environmental Health team.

The consultants working on behalf of the applicant have confirmed that noise readings used within the Master Plan are worst case for noise propagation including measuring for noise down wind of the source. In this instance therefore the predictions based on the new proposed scenario is such that this takes account of prevailing wind and does not omit this aspect. They have also confirmed the methodology of calculating the predicted noise from the Dash 8 which is one of the most common planes to use the airport. The equation used, confirms the nature of the sound reduction with distance and is satisfactory in terms of noise at the respective properties. This would result in the adjoining properties to the east receiving an additional noise of between 1-3dB which is barely audible above the existing noise levels generated. While this increase is only an average and therefore there will be times when the noise is greater than the 1-3dB identified this will be for such short periods of duration (only while aircraft are turning) that it is considered acceptable and no objections could be sustained on this basis.

Apparent numerical errors in the submitted report where the change received by one property is actually 2 rather than 1 dB has been clarified and is due to rounding within the calculations that lie behind the headline figure. It is accepted that this is a minor change and not one that affects the determination of the application.

The additional information received on 22 February 2010 confirms that in the opinion of the consultant no additional mitigation is required to safeguard the surrounding properties from additional noise. Given the scale and nature of the increase which the development would result in, the fact that the development does not generate or permit additional flights in itself (these could occur in any event) and that only one runway and one movement out of a potential four is affected, it is agreed that it is unreasonable to seek expensive acoustic baffles or screens at this time. Not only would these appear unsightly and have an additional visual impact that would need to be assessed but the

scale of the problem that they would be addressing is disproportionate to their cost necessity and likely impact.

Visual Impact

The visual impact from the proposed development is limited. This is because by its nature the airport and the surrounding landscaping has to be clear and relatively flat. Few public views would be achieved from the immediate road, although a limited view over and across the runway would be seen from the elevated area of the petrol filling station and service garage on the old A30 at Rockbeare. However these are distant views and not considered significantly harmful.

The lighting necessary is again likely to have a low impact being precisely located without significant spill or glare as this would undermine its own objectives and the safety of landing. Further the principle for lighting is already established by the existing layout and although a number will be set into the new pavement area rather than being pole mounted, there is no additional harm.

Flooding and drainage

The issues in respect of flooding and drainage arise from the formation of an additional area of impermeable surfacing (the new pavement area), the regraded landform around the pavement and proximity of an existing stream which is located to the immediate east of the proposed earthworks. However given the location of the site and the separation distance to sensitive receptors of flooding, it is not considered that flooding of either the site or third properties/land is significant. However to ensure that runoff rates are minimised it is proposed to install an underground storage system capable of accommodating climate change and a 1 in 100 year rainfall event. The Environment Agency have considered the submitted information and are satisfied with the details provided suitable conditions are imposed. In this instance it is reasonable to impose the conditions as requested in the event that permission is granted.

Archaeology

The application has been accompanied by a desk based study which has assessed the likely impact on the archaeological significance of the site. As with all such reports this has been passed to the Devon Historic Environment Service at Devon County Council for appraisal. In this instance the Service has raised no objections but because of the potential for additional finds, are seeking the imposition of a condition.

Ecology

Under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act and local policy there is a duty on Local Authorities to consider the impact of development on the habitats and local environments. In this instance it is recognised that the nearest European protected sites are located at the Pebblebed Heaths and the Exe Estuary. However given the separation distances involved and the assertion within the submission that the development would not lead to additional flight movements no objections could be sustained.

The local impact on birds bats and other protected species has also been considered. In this instance a 150m section of hedgerow would be removed to make way for the earthworks works associated with the runway. This is considered a species poor hedgerow and therefore of limited significance. It is recognised that this could affect the routes that bats are able to navigate by, but due to the existing disturbance close to the airport is of low sensitivity. It is also noted in mitigation that there are a number of other hedgerows within the vicinity which run north south and could be used as alternative bat commuting routes. The hedge however should not be removed during the nesting bird season to ensure that disturbance is limited

It has also been noted that the habitat within the vicinity of the site could sustain great crested newts although at this time no detailed study could be undertaken due to the season. However previous surveys on adjoining sites have not identified the presence of the species and therefore the likely presence is considered to be very low. Given the limited likelihood of presence, it is considered reasonable that this aspect is controlled by a condition in the event of approval and a further study undertaken in the spring.

Air quality

This is often a local concern around airports given the pollution potential from both aircraft movement in and around airports and the vehicular movements to the adjacent car parks. In this instance a series of air quality readings have been taken at the airport and show that in general the air quality is currently good. While the take off point would be moved to the east under the current proposal the likely impact on the receptors to the east is claimed to be negligible. Given that the existing air quality is assessed as good and given the limited change in distance between the source and receptors there is no evidence to dispute the findings. No objections are therefore raised.

Departure from Development Plan

Although this application is a technical departure(affecting land outside the boundary of the airport) and has been advertised as such , it is not necessary under the government guidance to inform the Secretary of State of the application or any intended decision. It is therefore open to the Committee to determine the application as appropriate.

CONCLUSIONS

With the exception of noise, where a small increase and its resulting harm to nearby properties has been identified, the remaining impacts from the proposed development is extremely limited. However these considerations have been on the basis that the development would not give rise to a longer “runway”, would not increase the number of flights and that the take off and landing points in an easterly direction and the landing in a westerly direction would not change. Given this important caveat to the considerations made, it is considered reasonable to raise no objections to the development but ensure that touch down zones and aiming point marks which are clearly shown on the runway and are agreed by the CAA do not change. This can be managed by condition and provides some control to the Local Planning Authority in respect of future growth and development through the length of the usable runway.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following planning conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission and shall be carried out as approved.
(Reason - To comply with section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
2. The site is included on the current database of potentially contaminative uses. A minimum Stage 1 risk assessment shall be undertaken, submitted to and agreed by this authority prior to the commencement of works. Should any contamination of soil and/or groundwater be discovered during development of the site, the Contaminated Land Officer of the Local Authority shall be contacted immediately. Site activities shall be suspended until such time as a procedure for addressing such contamination is agreed upon with the LPA and other regulating bodies.

Reason : To ensure that any contamination existing and exposed during the development is identified and remediated.

3. Prior to the commencement of development a detailed surface water management scheme that conforms to the FRA dated Dec 2009 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The work shall then be undertaken in accordance with the scheme with any variation necessary, previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority
Reason: To ensure that suitable drainage and surface water control exists for the permitted development.

4. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority.

The development shall be carried out at all times in strict accordance with the approved scheme, or such other details as may be subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure that an appropriate record is made of archaeological evidence that may be affected by the development

5. The runway modification hereby approved only relates to the provision of a pavement before threshold providing an improved Runway End Safety Area and a modified take off point for planes using the 26 runway towards Exeter. The touchdown zone and the aiming point markings shown on the aerial photograph that accompanies the application (dated 04-03-2009) on both the 26 and 08 runways shall not be moved, relocated or extended in any way without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and ensure that the touch down area/the length of the runway is not extended without consultation with the Local Planning Authority and the consideration of all associated impacts of an extended runway.

6. The development hereby permitted shall only be undertaken in accordance with the discussions and recommendations included in the submitted Phase 1 Habitat Survey dated December 2009. This shall include the undertaking of a survey to assess the presence of Great Crested Newts by an appropriate licence holder in the breeding season between March – July, and the results and any remediation/translocation necessary agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before any works commence.
Reason: To maintain the ecological status of the site and ensure the protection of protected species.

Informatives

The applicant is advised of the following Environment Agency guidance

1. Pumps for pumping out water from excavations should be sited well away from watercourses and surrounded by absorbent material to contain oil spillages and leaks.
2. Silty or discoloured water from excavations should be irrigated over grassland or passed via a settlement lagoon so that gross solids are removed. This Agency must be advised if a discharge to a watercourse is proposed.
3. Storage of fuels for machines and pumps should be well away from any watercourses. The tanks should be bunded or surrounded by oil absorbent material, regularly replaced when contaminated, to control spillage and leakage.
4. This Agency must be notified immediately of any incident likely to cause pollution.

Reasons for approval

IN GRANTING PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT, THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

1. The proposal makes adequate provision for the disposal of foul/surface water in the interest of flood/pollution prevention.
2. The proposal would not generate a level of noise that would unreasonably affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.
3. The design and visual appearance of the proposal does not harm the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area.
4. The proposal does no harm to wildlife interest.

Approved plans

B0489100-P-07,
08
10,
11 rev 2
13 rev 1,
17 rev 1,

List of Background Papers

Application file, consultations and policy documents referred to in the report.