

## CITY PLANS PANEL

FRIDAY, 25TH SEPTEMBER, 2020

**PRESENT:** Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, K Brooks,  
C Campbell, P Carlill, D Cohen,  
A Garthwaite, S Hamilton, G Latty, E Nash,  
D Ragan, P Wadsworth, and N Walshaw

### **31 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals against the refusal of inspection of documents.

### **32 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public**

There were no items identified where it was considered necessary to exclude the press or public from the meeting due to the confidential nature of the business to be considered.

### **33 Late Items**

There were no late items of business identified.

### **34 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests made at the meeting.

### **35 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: C Gruen, P Gruen and A Khan.

Councillors: K Brooks, S Hamilton and D Ragan were in attendance as substitute Members.

### **36 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2020 were submitted for comment/ approval.

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2020 be accepted as a true and correct record.

### **37 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

With reference to Minute No.28 (Matters Arising from the Minutes) the Chair reported there were a number of issues raised within that minute and could the Chief Planning Officer provide a brief update on each.

Referring to the possible over supply of purpose build Student Accommodation within the City Centre, the Chief Planning Officer reported that the Strategic Policy Team were currently in the process of drafting a report which would shortly be considered by Development Plans Panel/ Joint Plan Panel.

In terms of the size of student accommodation the Chief Planning Officer confirmed that if additional guidance was to be prepared, Members would be consulted as a matter of routine.

In respect of time delays in completing Section 106 Agreements, it was understood that the S106 associated with the Thorpe Park Retail Park was nearing completion.

**38 Application No. 20/02559/FU - Leeds Bradford Airport (LBA) - Position Statement**

With reference to the meeting of 30<sup>th</sup> January 2020 when Members received a pre-application presentation which described the proposals for a new terminal building for the airport and changes to the day time flight regime period.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which provided a position statement and explained the current situation reached in respect of this application.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

The Planning case officer addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site / location / context
- The new terminal would be environmentally sustainable, high quality, modern (fit for purpose) and would improve passenger experience, satisfy future demands and enable the airport to deliver on a highly ambitious sustainability agenda.
- The existing terminal building would remain and have a proposed new use
- The existing fuel farm would be relocated to a different part of the airport
- The new building will be located to the eastern area of the airport on the existing runway apron.
- The building would be on 4 levels (including a mezzanine level) and would be 34,100 sqm
- Lower ground floor would provide surface access to the forecourt and access to the main terminal by lifts and escalators

- Ground floor (main terminal) would provide the check in hall and the arrivals halls along with baggage reclaim, customs and baggage make up
- First floor mezzanine (main terminal) would include immigration and associated facilities linked to the western walkway
- Second floor (main terminal) – this includes central search and departure lounge with associated retail, food and beverage, duty free and premium lounges.
- A western walkway (Pier) will be provided alongside the new terminal building and will provide contact stands for approximately 12 aircraft.
- The new terminal building will be targeted as an ‘excellent’ accredited rating under the BREEAM standard which will be designed to maximise energy efficiency and incorporate energy generation on site.
- The proposal would involve a new and modified vehicular (and pedestrian/cycle) access from Whitehouse Lane. The existing car park will be reconfigured to provide new internal service roads, bus parking and pick up and drop off points. A new forecourt will be provided to the east of the terminal building.
- The proposal also involves changes to the day time flight regime which was originally approved in 1993. The current daytime period for the airport is 0700 to 2300, with the night time period 2300 to 0700. The proposal is to change the daytime period so it will be 0600 to 2330 and shorten the night time period to 2330 to 0600.

#### The Main issues for consideration

- Traffic generation
- Climate Change
- Air Quality
- Ecology
- Health implications
- Construction noise
- Design of the building, modern & simple
- Landscaping – Some tree loss, low in number and replaced
- Economic considerations – Airport may struggle to grow without investment

Members were informed that in addition to the representations already received an additional 35 objections had been received together with 5 supporting statements

The Panel heard from Mr Hywel Rees, Chief Executive Officer, Leeds/Bradford Airport who spoke in support of the application

Addressing the Panel Mr Rees said that although the traffic control tower and terminal building had undergone some modernisation over recent years, the original building was 55 years old and extensive modernisation was required if Leeds/Bradford was to compete with other airports. He explained the application included a new surface access strategy which would enhance

access by all modes of transport, other than car, including investment in public transport infrastructure (bus network) along with improved access for cycle and pedestrian permeability and contribution to the new railway station. It was intended the new terminal building would achieve an “excellent accredited rating under the BREEAM standard and would be designed to maximise energy efficiency and incorporate energy generation on site. He suggested that as technology develops newer quieter aircrafts could be introduced powered by bio fuel technology and hydrogen. In conclusion Mr Rees said all modernisation plans for LBA would be sustainable and work for the wider region.

Members raised the following questions:

- Members queried why emissions from flights could not be taking into account, there appeared to be differing legal opinion
- Members queried what consideration should be given to other climate-related legislation/agreements such as the Climate Change Act 2008, the Paris Agreement, and Leeds City Council’s own Climate Emergency and Carbon Budget;
- Could clarification be provided about the predicted passenger numbers 4 – 7 Million
- Under the new proposals would hackney carriage vehicles be able to pick up and drop off at the airport
- Members queried if a traffic assessment for the proposals had been undertaken
- In terms of aircraft noise, if the flight regime was to change, would the airport attract “superior carriers” which in turn could attract larger quieter aircraft and reduce noise
- Members queried if the proposed expansion was contrary to the National Policy on the role of regional airports
- In 1993 there were strict restrictions put in place for night time flying /noise levels, why was it now more acceptable to relax these
- Had any work been undertaken to understand the economic impact of not proceeding with the planned expansion
- The West Yorkshire Combined Authority were setting a pathway to de-carbonisation for the regions airports, does this authority take into account that work
- Predicted passenger numbers of up to 7 Million may increase Green House Gas Emissions, making the airport a major emitter
- In terms of “Claw back” if there were more flights out of LBA, 17% predicted, would that result in less flights from other UK airports
- Was emissions from International flights be a planning consideration, would some of these emissions effect the National Strategy
- Looking at the presented Computer Generated Images (CGI’s) the design of the proposed bus shelters does not look fit for purpose and there appears to be insufficient seating within the terminal building
- The rationale for establishing a red zone to allow drop off and pick up without charge, could a condition be included which required 20% of the public to travel by public transport

- Referring to paragraph 10.16 and the measuring of Green House Gas emissions linked to the different activities, Members queried if the information presented was based on current or future aviation technology, could future forecasting go up to 2050

In responding to the issues raised, officers together with applicant's representatives said:

- The Legal Advisor to the panel confirmed that legal advice was subject to interpretation, however, Queen's Counsel had been engaged by the City Council and would assist in providing the necessary clarification
- The Planning Case Officer reported that following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement in 2018 passenger numbers would be able to increase to 5 Million subject to new surface access requirements. The creation of the new terminal building would increase passenger numbers to 7 Million by 2030
- Officials from LBA confirmed that the existing arrangements did allow pick up and drop by hackney carriage vehicles, but the preference was for passengers to travel by public transport
- The LCC Highway Officer confirmed that a traffic assessment for the airport was nearing completion and it was expected there may be some general growth in airport traffic. In terms of traffic emissions it was suggested that there would be support for electric vehicles in the future.
- The Environmental Team Leader suggested that there may be a slight increase in aircraft noise in the first instance but only until the new quieter aircraft arrived
- Members were informed that the National Policy recognised the role of regional airports and proposals for expansion should be judged on their individual merits having regard in particular to economic and environmental impacts
- The Planning Case Officer confirmed strict night time conditions had been introduced previously but noise levels can now be mitigated
- The Chief Officer Economic Development said an economic assessment had been undertaken looking at tourism and freight for the airport which could result in the creation of up to 12,000 jobs. It was further reported that the assessment had been peer reviewed and found to be robust
- The Chief Planning Officer said the authority were working in a regional context and co-ordination was being carried out in a meaningful way
- Members were informed that the predicted increase in emission was 0.4% but it was understood the airport were trying to achieve a lower level
- Officials from LBA said claw back was a reference to carbon emissions, although there was a potential increase in number of aircraft flights and passenger number (to 7 Million) there should be no increase in the carbon quantum by 2030
- The Legal Advisor to the panel said the targets in the Climate Change Act 2008 only directly bind the Secretary of State, rather than the Local

Planning Authority, but this did not mean the fact that these targets exist was immaterial

- Members were informed that bus shelter and seating were included within the CGI's to give an indication of the overall scheme. Detailed plans for bus shelters and seating within the terminal building would be developed as the scheme progressed and could be subject to condition.
- The LCC Highway Officer said the intention was to expand the airport but without increasing car parking, currently 7,000 spaces, he suggested a shift was required for passengers and employees to move to public transport
- The City Centre Team Leader said that including such a condition may prove problematic, it had to be reasonable, proportionate and enforceable
- The Environmental Team Leader said the carbon emissions were based on flight modelling and that future forecasting could be provided.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- There was a need to understand further if the new flight regime would result in increased carbon emissions
- Unequivocal legal advice needs to be provided in terms of how carbon emissions are measured
- An increase in carbon emissions may prevent Leeds from reaching its zero carbon goal by 2030
- An increase in aircraft movements and traffic generation to and from the airport would result in a deterioration of air quality
- Increased aircraft movement and traffic generation would lead to an increase in noise
- Night time flying was a major issue locally
- Some Members were supportive of the earlier start time to allow for more aircraft rotations, as required by the carriers, others required further clarification
- Some Members were supportive of the proposal suggesting the application was a major driver for the prosperity of the city and would lead to the creation of 12,000 new jobs
- Some Members were of the view that there was a need to focus on the benefits that would be brought to the city
- People want to travel - if they cannot fly from a local airport they will go elsewhere and traffic generation on the M621 would increase creating more CO2 emission
- The proposal does not provide enough landscaping
- A number of Members suggested that the existing one hour free car parking needs to be retained
- Members were of the view that at some point in the future the old traffic control tower and terminal building require demolishing
- Members were of the view that this was a useful position statement but a lot more information/ clarification was required.

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and contributions suggesting some useful discussion had taken place but far more information /clarification was required.

**RESOLVED** – That the position statement be noted and that a further more detailed report be brought back to Panel in due course.

**39 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2020 at 1.30pm (Remote Meeting)