REPORT OF THE CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER

PLANS PANEL WEST

Date: 9 SEPTEMBER 2010.

Subject: APPLICATION 09/05365/FU – CHANGE OF USE OF GENERAL INDUSTRIAL UNIT TO OFF AIRPORT CAR PARKING AT UNIT 1A, LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, HARROGATE ROAD, Yeadon, Leeds, LS19 7WP.

APPLICANT
The Learmonth Property Investment Co Ltd

DATE VALID
10 December 2009

TARGET DATE
11 March 2010

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. It is considered that the proposed development would undermine the Council objectives of providing sustainable surface access for the benefit of all airport users and the wider community by providing parking outside the remit of a plan-led approach for future parking requirements at Leeds Bradford Airport. It is therefore contrary to Policies T24 and T30 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and to the aims of the Leeds Bradford International Airport Adopted Airport Surface Access Strategy (2006) and Masterplan (2005 - 2016).

2. The proposed development as submitted would result in a reduction in the choice of large readily available industrial and warehouse properties of known good quality and the applicant has failed to show that the alternatives available locally are sufficient and of equivalent or better quality. Therefore it is considered that the loss of the unit and its potential for economic activity in the future would cause harm to the Council’s interest in maintaining opportunities for local employment uses in the locality of west and north-west Leeds, contrary to Policy E7 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006).
3. It is considered that the proposals would materially add to problems of safety and efficiency on the highway network surrounding Leeds Bradford Airport as the proposed shuttle bus arrangements fail to have access to the airport forecourt which would allow safe and easy access for passengers. It is considered that the proposed pick up and drop off proposals on Whitehouse Lane would cause a danger to pedestrian and highway safety by virtue of its layout, proximity to the mini roundabout, location of pedestrian crossing and trolley bays on highway land and adjacent the public highway. It is therefore contrary to Policies GP5, T2, T2D and T6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and guidance contained in Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport (PPG13).

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

1.1 The Chief Planning Officer considers that this application should be referred to the Plans Panel for determination along with another current application for airport car parking, because of their significance and impact on the local area.

2.0 PROPOSAL:

2.1 The proposed development consists of the change of use of the existing Unit 1a at Leeds Bradford Airport Industrial Estate to provide long stay off-site car parking for Leeds Bradford International Airport.

2.2 100 spaces would be provided on the existing staff car parking in front of Unit 1A with the remaining 543 spaces provided within the unit. This would provide a total of 643 parking spaces, including disabled provision.

2.3 Access to the car parking would be taken via the existing Unit 1A site access junction onto the A658 Harrogate Road. The existing junction onto Harrogate Road is an island right turn arrangement. The existing junction geometry is provided to a standard capable of accommodating HGV traffic to the estate, and includes a gatehouse arrangement to monitor access to the industrial estate.

2.4 A number of other units also share the existing access onto Harrogate Road and the existing arrangement would, therefore, be retained in order to continue to serve the rest of the estate plus the proposed car parking in Unit 1A.

2.5 The application proposes that upon arrival, customers would park in a drop off area situated outside of Unit 1A and report to a manned desk. Customers would unpack their car, hand their keys to a member of staff and then transfer to the airport terminal by shuttle bus service. The staff member would then park the vehicle within one of the 643 long stay spaces provided.

3.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

3.1 Leeds Bradford Airport Industrial Estate (LBAIE) comprises a single building of circa 1.3 million sq ft split into a number of industrial units. The estate is situated adjacent to the A658 Harrogate Road just to the north east of the airport.

3.2 The unit which is the subject of this application is Unit 1A. This is located in the north western corner of the building. Unit 1A has a secure service yard area which includes 210 existing car parking spaces.

3.3 Unit 1A is of steel lattice construction with low headroom of approximately 4.7 metres. To the northern elevation there are some ancillary offices, part open plan
and part compartmentalised. In all, Unit 1A comprises an approximate gross internal area of 153,340 sq ft (14,245 sq m).

3.4 There are two access roads into the site from the A658 Harrogate Road, one at the north western corner close to Unit 1A and the other at the south western corner of the site. Access is gated and controlled with on-site 24 hour security and the site also has CCTV coverage.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

4.1 The history of the Leeds Bradford Industrial Estate dates back to 1939 when Avro built the original building to produce military aircraft. There are a significant number of planning applications relating to the Leeds Bradford Airport Industrial Estate due to the age of the building.

4.2 Following a review of the Council’s records the following planning history on the site is considered relevant:-

- Late 1970’s – Various applications relating to the change of use of the building from an airport storage depot to a warehouse and packaging premises.

- 1980’s – Various applications relating to Units 7, 8, 9, 12b relating to changes of use to warehousing, including numerous ancillary developments.

- Planning Application Ref. H29/133/88 (Unit 1) – Change of use of part of depot to general industrial use approved.

- Planning Application Ref. H29/247/88 (Unit 1) – Alterations including re-cladding of part new frontage to form two industrial units approved.

- 1990’s – various applications including the erection of the Gatehouses and the change of Units 8 and 9 to light industrial use; a change of use of Units 8 and 9 to light industrial use; Unit 6 to general industrial use.

4.3 From the planning history of the site and its historical use, the planning status of the properties is considered to be for general industrial and storage and distribution purposes with uses varying between units from uses within the B2 Use Class and the B8 Use Class for storage and distribution.

4.4 With specific regard to Unit 1A, consent was granted in 1988 as a general industrial unit. The unit was last occupied by AETC Limited, a manufacturing company that ceased occupation in 2008. The existing planning status of Unit 1A and its curtilage parking/service yard is therefore regarded in planning terms as a general industrial unit falling within the B2 Use Class of the Town & Country (Use Classes) Order.

5.0 HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS:

5.1 A briefing for members representing the wards of Horsforth, Otley and Yeadon, Adel and Wharfedale and Guiseley and Rawdon was held in the Civic Hall on 19 January 2010 to update members on both of the current off-airport car parking applications.

5.2 During the determination process of the application, discussions have taken place with the applicant in relation to off-site highway works, parking demand at the airport and potential impact on aviation safeguard issues.
6.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:

6.1 The application has been advertised in accordance with General Development Procedure Order, in this case incorporating the following elements:

- On site by the means of site notices (making reference to a major development.)
- The application has also been made available for public inspection at Yeadon and Otley Libraries;

6.2 The publicity period for this application expired on the 7 January 2010 and the following representations have been received.

Ward Councillors:

6.3 Councillors Ryk Downes (Otley and Yeadon) and Clive Fox (Adel and Wharfedale) have confirmed they would wish the application be presented to Members of Plans Panel West for determination.

6.4 Councilor Fox has also stated that “It appears to me there has been no community involvement whatsoever. Certainly the parish council has not been involved and I am not aware there have been any public meetings or exhibitions.

Amenity Groups:

6.5 Aireborough Civic Society objects to this application on grounds that his application ignores the congestion that is caused by passengers driving to the airport. Parking spaces need to be limited and controlled by the local authority in order to encourage greater use of public transport, more car parking discourages this. In addition the site should be retained in employment use, car parking does not generate many jobs and in order to have a sustainable mix within the local economy it is important that units suitable for manufacturing are retained. The lack of local consultation is also criticised.

Interested Third Parties:

Leeds Bradford International Airport: The airport has submitted detailed objections to the application. The essence of these objections is that the airport can satisfactorily accommodate the need for car parking within its own operational site, not in the short term but through the introduction of blocked car parking or alternative arrangements such as decked car parking. In addition:
   - The application is contrary to the transport, airport and employment policies of the Leeds Unitary Plan (UDP).
   - Future car parking requirements will be assessed through a review of the ASAS and Airport Masterplan. This is the appropriate mechanism for determining demand and if required the location of any additional new car parks;
   - The development of off site car parking will undermine LBIA’s transport strategy and the approach agreed to manage surface access through the Terminal Extension planning permission. The application will encourage not discourage car use

7.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES:
Statutory Consultees:

7.1 **Highway Authority** – The Transport Assessment carried out demonstrates that there is currently more than sufficient provision of car parking on and off the airport site to meet current needs, although this takes into account the current car parking facility at Sentinel which does not have planning permission. On this basis, objections are raised to the application which results in an unsustainable over-provision of long-stay car parking. In addition, the Highway Authority objects to the proposed means of transfer of passengers from the car parking facility to the airport. These are:

- Drop off passengers with their luggage at the bus stops on White House Lane. This is not acceptable due in part to the excessive walking distance to the terminal.
- Drop off passengers at a new dedicated lay by on the north side of White House Lane. This is closer than the bus stops (although still 250m distant) but far from ideal. In addition, passengers would have to cross White House Lane which is unacceptable.
- Drop off passengers at the terminal building. This is acceptable but there is no agreement from the Airport for such an arrangement and this is therefore not deliverable at the current time.

7.2 **Mains Drainage** - No objections subject to conditions.

**Leeds and Bradford International Airport** – The size of the building’s roof makes it attractive as a bird roost for gulls during the winter months which cross the runway to reach Yeadon Tarn. This is a risk to aircraft safety and in the event of permission being granted measures would be sought to reduce the risk to flight safety.

Non Statutory Consultees:

7.3 **Transport Policy (Travel Wise)** - No objections subject to a revised Travel Plan being submitted and monitored through a section 106 legal agreement.

7.4 **Metro** - supports the general development of the airport however have some concerns about this application for additional long stay car parking. It is considered that additional parking at the current time is unsustainable and not necessary.

7.5 **NGT/Public Transport** – Concerns are raised into whether car parking prices could be controlled by condition (as in the city centre) and/or some link to the Airport’s own price tariff?

7.6 **Access Officer** - No objections following the submission of revised plans.

7.7 **Neighbourhoods and Housing** - No objections.

7.8 **Environmental Health Services (Air Quality)** - No objections.

7.9 **Bramhope and Carlton Parish Council** – No objections.

8.0 **PLANNING POLICIES:**

8.1 By virtue of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the application should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As confirmed by the Department of Communities and Local Government on the 6 July 2010, the Secretary of State has announced the revocation of the Regional Strategies. Therefore the Development
Plan now consists of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). Locally Leeds City Council has begun work on its Local Development Framework (“LDF”) and in the interim period a number of the policies contained in the Leeds Unitary Development Plan have been ‘saved’. The Leeds UDP Review was adopted in 2006.

8.2 The industrial estate buildings are not specifically allocated for development in the UDP Proposals Map and are regarded, therefore, as “white land”. However, to the south of the buildings (Policy Designation E4.2) there is an area of land allocated for future industrial development. The site is adjacent to but not within the Green Belt and falls outside of (but is adjacent to) the airport operational land boundary.

8.3 The most relevant Policies in the adopted Leeds Unitary Development Plan are listed below. This proposal should comply with these policies in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant Unitary Development Plan Policies

Strategic Policies
SA4 and SA6: aim to promote and strengthen the economic base of Leeds and promote tourist visits to the city respectively.

Environmental Policies
N13: refers to design of new buildings should be of high quality and have regard to character and appearance of surroundings.
LD1: Landscaping provision on new developments.
GP5: seeks to ensure all detailed planning considerations are resolved as part of the application process including the protection of amenity and highway safety.

Transport Policies
T2: Development should be capable of being served by the highway network and not add to or create problems of safety.
T2b: Major planning applications to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment.
T2c – Planning applications which are significant generators of travel demand must be accompanied by a Travel Plan.
T2d: Promotes public transport accessibility to developments.
T6: Access and provision for disabled people and other people with mobility problems.
T9: An effective public transport service will be encouraged and supported where practical to give access to facilities.
T15: Encourages measures to give priority to bus movements and improve vehicle accessibility.
T24a: Planning permission will not be granted for new long-stay car parking outside the curtilage of existing or proposed employment Premises.
T30: Provision will be made for the continued growth of the airport subject to improvements to transport infrastructure.
T30a: Relates to uses considered acceptable at the airport within the Airport Operational Land Boundary including staff, visitor and passenger car parks.

Employment Policies
E4 (1) - Under this policy the site is allocated for employment purposes as part of a 20.9 HA employment site at Harrogate Road/Warren House Lane.

E7 – States that applications outside the B uses classes (non-employment uses) will not be permitted on land identified for employment purposes or current employment sites unless criteria can be met including that the site is not reserved for specific employment purposes under policies E8 and E18, that there is sufficient alternative employment land locally and district-wide and that environmental or traffic problems would not result.

E8 (1) – This policy identifies 12.9 HA of the above employment site as a Key Employment Site which should be preserved for the full range of employment uses.

E18 (1) – 8 HA of the allocated employment land is identified as a Key Business Park reserved for B1 uses (mainly offices).

E19 – States that Prestige Office Development will be promoted on the Key Business Park sites.

**National Planning Policies:**
Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (“PPS1”) sets out the Government’s national policies on different aspects of land use planning in England.


**Supplementary Planning Guidance:**
Supplementary Planning Guidance provides a more detailed explanation of how strategic policies of the Unitary Development Plan can be practically implemented. The following SPGs are relevant and have been included in the Local Development Scheme, with the intention to retain these documents as ‘guidance’ for local planning purposes:

Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions SPD (July 2008) sets out the circumstances and basis for obtaining financial contributions for improvements to public transport infrastructure from developments that generate a significant level of trips

Travel Plans SPD (May 2007) Sets out the Council’s approach to travel planning.

**Strategic Council Objectives**
The ‘Vision for Leeds’ seeks to develop Leeds’ role as the regional capital, contributing to the national economy as a competitive European city, supporting and supported by a region that is becoming increasingly prosperous. Continued growth of the airport with overseas trade (and associated public transport infrastructure) is a vital part of attaining these ambitions.

**Airport Masterplan 2005-2016:**
Under the previous owners, a masterplan for LBIA was published in 2006 by the airport, following two periods of consultation. It sets out proposals for how the growth set out in the White Paper can be delivered and managed and identifies proposals for surface access and environment controls. The masterplan forecasts growth to 5.1 million passengers per annum throughput by 2016 and 8.2 million passengers per annum throughput by 2030. These forecasts are slightly ahead of the figures forecast in 2003 through the Air Transport White Paper. Fundamentally, however, both the Air Transport White Paper and the airport’s masterplan support the growth of the airport.
9.0 MAIN ISSUES:

1. Employment policy
2. Transport policy and the need for airport car parking
3. Highway Safety
4. Other material considerations

10.0 APPRAISAL:

Employment policy

10.1 The essence of Council policy as set out in the UDPR is that allocated and existing employment sites should normally be reserved for employment purposes. Is airport car parking "employment development" as defined in the UDP Review 2006? On legal advice with regard to relevant case law, officers’ view is that the proposed use is ‘sui generis’and not an “employment use” at least in terms of UDP definitions which defines such uses as those falling within the ‘B’ Use Classes – offices, industrial buildings etc. Policy E7 of the UDP requires that existing employment sites are retained for employment uses to maintain an adequate supply and variety of such sites unless a number of criteria are met, the main one being that there is an adequate alternative supply of sites both locally and district-wide.

10.2 It is rare that the loss of a single property would create an issue with the district-wide supply of employment land as a whole. As a property, however, there is a significant issue in that buildings of more than 100k sqft are a comparative rarity, as they tend to be bespoke rather than speculatively built. At the current time there are eight 100k sqft plus premises on the market throughout the Leeds District. From this evidence there is concern that its loss would reduce the choice of large readily available properties of known good quality.

10.3 The agent has submitted a schedule of available sites and properties within a five mile radius of the LBAIE. But the schedule shows that not all of the properties can be counted as suitable alternatives to LBAIE. The choice of a 5-mile radius gives a locality that is highly comparable with other travel-time contours used in other parts of west and NW Leeds. Given this, there are many properties and sites on the submitted schedule that must be discounted, as they fall outside the 5 mile contour. These reduce the total to 689,930 sqft, plus the additional 204k sqft at LBAIE. This still seems substantial, but it is dominated by one entry of 415.6k sqft at Clariant Works, which is now off the market pending the submission of an application for a residential-led mixed use development by Harrow Estates. This reduces the available premises to 274.3k sqft plus the additional unit at LBAIE (204k sqft). Within the remaining properties, several are split into small(er) units and there is only one listed that is comparable in size to the subject property - this is at Otley Road Shipley, where single a unit of 131k sqft is available. The conclusion from this is that the evidence submitted does not warrant the conclusion that the local supply is plentiful and of equivalent or better quality as required by policy E7 and that the building should therefore be retained for employment uses.

10.4 The occupancy data submitted shows that just over 50% of the space at LBAIE is vacant and has remained so for about 2 years despite active marketing through major agents in the city. Using data for the last 10 years the argument is put forward that the decline in market attractiveness of LBAIE is structural and unlikely to be reversed. Examination of the data shows that the rise in vacancy has been sudden in the last 2 or 3 years. But prior to this, vacancy actually fell year on year from 2001 to 2006 and in 2007 vacancy was below or comparable with levels in
The last ten years therefore show a mixed picture. Vacancy increased year-on-year on 4 occasions, but was steady for 2 years and fell for 4 years.

10.5 In fact there has been very little provision of large B2/B8 units within the city over the past 10 years: while development of large schemes has been focused on Aire Valley sites. These have mainly been bespoke developments for existing Leeds businesses seeking to relocate. Speculative developments have tended to provide units of less than 100k sqft. So, the provision of open-market general-availability large-scale B8 or B2 units has been limited and has not posed a major source of competition to LBAIE over the past ten years.

10.6 It is the conventional wisdom that large-scale B8 developments seek strategic motorway-related locations and in this context LBAIE does appear to be at a disadvantage. However, the logistics industry is multi-layered, often expressed in the size of unit sought by the operator. Large-scale regional distribution centres requiring 500k sqft and larger will require a strategic motorway location; less extensive operations will have a wider tolerance of locations. The process of concentration of logistics operators into the motorway corridors has been going on for over 30 years - in Leeds one of the earliest developments of this kind can be seen around J27/M62, dating from the early 1970s. During this period LBAIE has managed to compete and, as the vacancy figures show, it achieved almost full occupancy immediately before the recession set in. At the current time the evidence presented does not show that the facility has no future at all.

10.7 It is noted that the prospects for air-freight related business at LBAIE do not seem to be good, given the airport's view stated in the masterplan. What also seems to be evident, however, is the scale of freight operations at the airport has been small compared to other regional airports. This would appear to have been the case in 1997, but in the period since LBAIE has attracted tenants nevertheless.

10.8 The decline in air freight on LBAIE is sited as a reason for the lack of demand for space at the unit and in fact two of the current tenants listed are directly related to air freight activities associated with the airport. Other tenants over the years appear to be either distributors acting for major British high street retailers or local businesses using available space at reasonable cost. It would appear that LBAIE’s reliance on air freight has been limited over the past 10 years and it is true that the two businesses that can be identified as directly related to air freight are still tenants.

10.9 The building is not ideal in its design. The low eaves height available in the building is cited as a disadvantage in the market place. 4.7m is indeed lower than older warehouse properties, which typically would have at least 5m eaves height. LBAIE is not the lowest, but it is not particularly favourable compared with older properties and is clearly much lower than modern or new build units which may have 6m or 9m eaves heights.

10.10 It is clear that the owners have marketed the unit and others at LBAIE actively over the past decade. The submitted report makes no mention of the recession and its impact on the logistics industry in particular, which has been severe. This is an important factor in this case; the owners have been affected by circumstances that have affected everyone else. Looking at the amount of vacant space in prime locations in the motorway corridors in authorities adjacent to Leeds (Wakefield and Selby) shows the extent of the impact of the downturn. There would appear to be good prospects for re-letting once the economic recovery gains momentum.
10.11 The proposal is expected to generate a minimum of 16 jobs. Not surprisingly, this is well below the theoretical job generation expected from a B2 or B8 operation. Using conventional densities from ODPM’s guide to Employment Land Reviews, the unit has the notional capacity for c. 400 jobs under B2 and c. 200 jobs under B8. In the current economic situation it is difficult to give such high numbers great weight, but they do indicate the potential of the unit in more favourable economic conditions.

10.12 It is concluded that the case to lose this building to ‘employment’ usage is not justified at the current time and that it provides valuable space in a large building which should be readily lettable in a recovering economy.

**Transport Policy and the need for airport car parking**

10.13 The Council’s district wide long stay car parking policy (Policy T24a of the UDPR) states that planning permission will not be granted for New long-stay car parking outside the curtilage of existing or proposed employment premises except in certain circumstances where lack of parking within employment premises would cause serious traffic, safety or environmental problems in the surrounding area. In this case proposals must be supported by a traffic assessment, including appraisal of other means of accessibility to the site, including public transport. Where planning permission is granted the extent of parking allowed will not exceed that which would otherwise be permissible under the car parking guidelines, related to the scale of the employment use.

10.14 In its submission objecting to the application, Leeds Bradford International Airport submits that it is proposing to complete a further 1000 car parking spaces at the airport this year (this is now complete) and that this will be sufficient (4482 spaces) to meet current demand (2.5 million passengers per annum (mppa)) and demand up to 3.8mppa. Should it be necessary to provide more car parking, this can be accommodated within the airport site through measures such as block parking arrangements and the construction of decked car parking areas. The airport further submits that the provision of car parking off-site is contrary to Council UDPR policy and serves to undermine the co-ordinated and sustainable delivery of an airport surface access strategy.

10.15 The applicant counters that the Council acknowledges that there is a current need for additional car parking above what can be provided at the airport and that the application site can usefully provide some of this in a sustainable location in close proximity to the airport site.

10.16 Council officers cannot agree with the airport’s conclusion that there is currently sufficient car parking for LBIA without off-site provision or that the airport has sufficient parking for its needs during the next peak summer period in 2011. From observations this summer it appears that even with the last phase of the 2005 car parking permission open that the current demand for long stay car parking could not be accommodated within the airport's long stay car park and that at present there is a need for around 1700 off-airport car parking spaces. It is recognised that currently there is a strong seasonal demand for car parking space which is concentrated in the July to September period. It is also recognised that the airport is seeking to make better and more efficient use of its car parking by smoothing out the peaks and getting a better spread of flights throughout the year. The airport is committed to the production of another Surface Access Strategy in 2011 and is in the process of installing a number of counters around the airport which will give further data on traffic levels throughout the year.
10.17 Whist it may be possible to accommodate more spaces within the airport site, planning permission would be required to amend the approved layout and operation of the existing long stay car parks to allow a meet and greet service to work to enable block parking to occur. Whilst block parking has the potential to make better use of the existing space it does restrict the options open at the airport for any customers who are not prepared to surrender their car keys. In addition any decking of existing car parks would clearly be a longer term solution. This would also need planning permission and a period of construction.

10.18 Officers therefore remain of the opinion that 1700 spaces in addition to the airport provision is required in the short to medium term until a more robust assessment of car parking demand can be made by the airport and planned for through the surface access strategy and airport masterplan process. This needs to be completed and an action plan agreed before any existing airport car parking is lost. At the present time this provision is more than dealt with by the Sentinel car parking provision which is the subject of the other airport car parking application on the agenda, albeit that this parking is currently not a lawful planning use of the land.

Highway Safety

10.19 At present the application does not include for a viable safe means of transporting passengers from the parking site to the airport terminal. Although passengers can be brought via minibus on an internal access road through the wider industrial site to White House Lane, the proposal then is to deposit passengers either at the bus stops on White House Lane or at a new lay by on the north side of White House Lane. This is not acceptable due in part to the excessive walking distance to the terminal. Alternatively, passengers would be dropped off at a new dedicated lay by on the north side of White House Lane. This is closer than the bus stops (although still 250m distant) but unacceptable, in particular for the disabled or others with mobility issues. In addition, passengers would have to cross White House Lane which is unacceptable. Either option would result in undesirable parking and maneuvering on White House Lane. To be viable, the service would need to drop off passengers at the terminal building, but there is no agreement from the Airport for such an arrangement and this is therefore not deliverable at the current time.

Other material considerations:

10.20 The site is not in the Green Belt and would have limited visual impact as most of the parking would take place within the building.

10.21 In the event of a temporary or permanent planning permission, a number of matters would need to be addressed through a legal agreement under S.106 of the Planning Act. These would include provision for a staff Travel Plan and Monitoring fee; a Public Transport Infrastructure contribution and provision for monitoring stations and agreements over pricing structure.

11.0 CONCLUSION

11.1 It is concluded that the evidence demonstrates a current need for permission for off-site airport car parking provision in the region of 1700 spaces although this is currently being met by the unauthorised airport car parking at the Sentinel, Coney Park site.
11.2 There are however concerns that a permission for car parking on the LBAIE site could both lead to a harmful future loss of valuable employment land, and in particular a large type of industrial building which is in relatively short supply, to the district with implications for the economy.

11.3 The proposed car parking would also lead to an unsustainable and uncoordinated approach to long stay parking outside of an agreed Airport Surface Access Strategy. Whist it is acknowledged that there is an unsatisfied need for around 1700 long term car parking spaces which cannot be met at the current time on the airport site, the LBAIE site is currently not considered suitable for this due to the valuable characteristics of these large industrial buildings to future employers and due to the lack of suitable and safe means of transportation of passengers to the airport site. The applicants have indicated their willingness to consider a temporary permission at the LBAIE site but this cannot be supported by officers at present given the lack of a suitable and safe means of access for passengers to the airport terminal.

Background Papers:
Application case file