

# **London Southend Airport & Environs Joint Area Action Plan Issues & Options Report Summary of Responses to Consultation**

The following provides a brief summary of comments submitted as part of consultation on the Issues and Options document. It should be read in conjunction with the comments in their entirety, which can be viewed at <http://rochford.jdi-consult.net/jaap>

## **Section 1.1 What is a Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP)?**

GO East reminded the Councils for the need to ensure the JAAP is prepared in line with the new PPS 12 and guidance. English Heritage welcomed the definition of JAAPs as ensuring the protection of areas and places sensitive to change. Concern was expressed that residents were not aware of consultation or would struggle to comment on the issues. Concern was also expressed that the proposed expansion of the airport was at odds with national, European and international targets to reduced carbon dioxide emissions, that the economic benefits will be short-lived and outweighed by the economic damage of climate change.

### **Section 1.1.1 The Evidence Base**

CPRE expressed concern about the potential impact of proposals on Church of St Laurence and All Saints, citing the evidence base. CPRE also state that they find it unacceptable that the development proposals in the JAAP have no concrete accompanying surface access plan. CPRE expressed concerns about the impact of increased aviation activity and traffic on air quality.

CPRE stated they would support council policies to safeguard and enhance the Maintenance Repair and Overhaul (MRO) business, its employment and skill base. They note that MRO employment currently outweighs aviation employment by a factor of about 7 (910 to 140).

Concern was expressed that the evidence base did not consider the environmental and quality of life impacts of proposals. London Southend Airport noted stated there were some minor errors in the evidence base, but these did not effect the soundness of the evidence submitted.

Comments claimed the evidence base indicated the expansion of the airport in its own right will do little to accommodate existing or new businesses. The evidence base does not detail what benefits there would be to Rochford or Southend residents.

The Environment Agency stated that the Flood Zones discussed in the evidence base should be the planning definitions, not the household insurance ones.

English Heritage felt that cultural heritage issues had not been properly considered in the main issues and constraints. CPRE queried numerous aspects of the evidence base, including the omission of two listed buildings, and the lack of a genuinely sustainable surface access strategy.

Other comments queried whether the cost of fuel had been a consideration.

### **Section 1.1.2 Sustainability Appraisal**

GO East reminded the Councils for the need to ensure the JAAP is developed having regard to a sustainability appraisal that considers alternatives, and that it is accompanied by a robust evidence base. London Southend Airport believes there are a number of minor errors with the Sustainability Appraisal. The Environment Agency noted that sections of the JAAP are in areas of high flood risk, not medium as stated.

CPRE highlight a number of the negative impacts identified in the Sustainability Appraisal and express concern that the report is overly optimistic in terms of how these impacts can be mitigated.

Other comments claimed that sustainability was a moot point when considering the expansion of an airport and that there was a very weak case for expanding the airport, particularly given spare capacity at other airports.

### **Section 1.2 What will the Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP) include**

Respondents pointed out that Rochford Core Strategy is at an early stage and has not yet been adopted. Concern about impact on residents, particularly in terms of noise. Concern that the JAAP does not consider the environmental impacts of carbon dioxide emissions and the long-term economic impact of aviation expansion, given the economic impacts of climate change. Concern that the JAAP does not consider the negative impacts on communities to the south of the Thames, particularly Hoo Peninsula.

### **Section 1.3 The Issues and Options Report**

EERA note that there is a potential a conflict between the conformity of the RSS and the JAAP insofar as the need to remove some of the green belt for new industrial development has not been specifically included in the list of necessary strategic reviews of green belt boundaries. EERA claim that the proximity of the airport is not an important factor for the location of the existing businesses near the airport, and the domestic Maintenance Repair and Overhaul (MRO) industry faces pressure from less-costly labour pools of Asia, and Latin America, the justification for further expansion needed to review the boundary may be limited.

EERA also state that nearly a third of business surveyed were deterred from locating in the area because of the proximity of the airport and that this will be a significant factor deterring B1 (Office/light industrial) uses that, as the supporting evidence highlights, will be the most likely source of employment growth.

Other representations stated that the JAAP should include an option of gradual reduction of aviation capacity and that the JAAP had not addressed how obligations to reduce carbon emission had been met.

### **Section 1.4 Policy context for the JAAP**

GO East reminded the Councils of the need for an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Directive for any proposals that have the potential to impact upon the Natura 2000 network. They remind the Councils that it will be necessary to determine whether the JAAP has such potential.

Representations stated that the basic premise of the government's White Paper on aviation, that there will be a growth in air transport, may now be wrong given the current economic climate. The current ability of, or potential of improving, the transport infrastructure to cope with airport expansion was questioned. Representations stated the need for joined up working between tiers of government to prevent climate change. Other comments expressed concern over the impact of the JAAP on nearby ecological sites.

### **Section 1.5 Getting Your Views**

Comments stated that consultation was not wide enough and that not enough time had been given to respond. Other comments stated that it was not appropriate to stage consultation within the 'holiday season' and that it had been poorly advertised.

### **Section 2.1 The JAAP Area**

Concern expressed that St Lawrence Orchard, Rochford Hundred Golf Club and Rochford Tennis are not recorded. Objection to use of Green Belt land. Concern regarding impact on schools in the area expressed. Comments noted that much of the existing employment land is around the airport boundary and subject to aviation electronic navigation systems and which restricts new development .

### **Section 2.2 London Southend Airport**

The need for a new train station given the proximity of Rochford's was questioned. Concern was expressed over the lack of infrastructure.

Objections to any expansion of the airport were made. Comments stated that the airport was not the be all and end all of employment issues in the area.

Concerns were also expressed over inaccuracies and contradictions within the evidence base.

### **Section 2.3 Supply and demand for employment areas**

Representations queried what alternatives to an airport had been considered. Comments questioned the need for additional office space, claiming there is already an over supply in Southend. Respondents noted that there may be an opportunity to relieve congestion on roads by transporting goods by rail. Other comments included the observation that the mix of employment uses indicated that there was not a reliance on the aviation sector for employment.

### **Section 2.4 Transport & Accessibility**

Arriva Southern Counties expressed concern at the possible loss of the link via Eastwoodbury Lane

Southend University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust were concerned that increased congestion would deter their staff from using the shuttle bus service transferring staff based in office accommodation in Comets Way, to the hospital. They also expressed concern that further obstructions for blue light ambulance access to the hospital could occur. Southend University Hospital suggest that airport passenger park and ride schemes would be an essential element of any development.

Southend University Hospital also expressed concern over the impact of increased noise from the high-growth option on patients

Concerns were expressed that airport expansion was not viable given current levels of congestion on the local highway network. Objections to expansion of airport made, with concerns expressed over noise, emissions and traffic. Concerns also expressed that airport may not be viable given the state of the global economy.

Respondents suggested that the use of the bus service should be encourage , but that the cycle routes are virtually non-existent and those that are in place are currently not fit for purpose.

### **Section 2.5 Environmental character and assets**

Comments stressed the need to ensure that environmental protection measures proposed at the policy stage were not diluted at implementation.

Concern was expressed with regards to increased air pollution and the impacts of this on health, particularly the health of local school children. Concern was also expressed about the impact of the expansion of the airport on the local housing market.

Noise is a concern, although it was noted that this may be mitigated by the use of quieter planes. Responses stated that clear reports on the increase in noise from aircraft and pollution levels need to be provided to all residents, especially those living by the airport and under flight paths. The question was asked, whether those that will be affected will be able to make the decisions.

Essex County Council noted that pedestrian access is quite well connected but would benefit from a link between the former brickworks site and St Andrews Church to provide a green traffic free path for the Roach Valley Way promoted route. They suggest that further routes and road/rail crossing facilities are required to connect existing paths which would also providing sustainable links to Purdeys Industrial Estate.

## **Section 2.6 Conclusions**

Comments included a suggestion that night flights be eliminated completely and concern expressed over the proximity of the railway line and the potential for a plane to come short of the runway onto this.

### **Question 2.1 – Are the assets of the JAAP area fully reported and understood?**

The majority of respondents stated 'Yes' only 13% said 'No'. Environmental issues were raised in respect of house devaluation, traffic, noise and air pollution.

### **Question 2.2 – Are there any important assets or issues missing from the assessment?**

Respondents were concerned with the number of flights planned along with the possibility of night flights, the relationship of the potential development to the existing strategic highway infrastructure and danger; as all areas surrounding Southend Airport are built up, unlike Stansted and Gatwick. Other omitted issues raised include a business jet handling agent, land contamination, water use/resource and water quality, waste issues during and after construction. It was also noted that the Church of St Laurence and All Saints, Rochford Hundred Golf Course, Rochford Tennis Club and an ancient orchard off Eastwoodbury Lane were not mentioned.

### **Section 3.1 Vision**

Concern expressed by GO East that the vision expressed was more of a statement of intent and description of characteristics, rather than a vision of how the area would look in the future.

Others expressed concern at the perceived lack of reference to quality of life.

### **Section 3.2 Objectives of the JAAP**

Concerns include lack of clear direction or business plan. Other concerns included lack of appreciation of environmental issues.

### **Questions 3.1 – 3.3**

#### **Question 3.1 – Do you agree with the overall Vision for the JAAP?**

One comment states – consider the vision for London Southend Airport to be inadequate and unfit for purpose, would like to see the Vision modified so that it highlights a commitment to developing the Airport into a small regional airport to serve the Essex Thames Gateway sub-region and a Vision that specifically highlights the need to provide first class infrastructure links for residents and workers. It was also noted that ‘at present, the vision is not consistent with Objective SO11 of the Southend Core Strategy which recognises that the regeneration of London Southend Airport should be subject to environmental safeguards’. English Heritage suggested the following amendment: ‘...employment opportunities while safeguarding the quality of life of its residents and workers. To achieve this, the area’s environmental assets will be protected and supported in tandem with the promotion of economic activity.’ 58% of the responses received agreed with the overall vision for the JAAP.

#### **Question 3.2 – Do the objectives set out above cover the key requirements from the area?**

An objection was raised to the lack of preservation of Rochford and the surrounding environment. Issues were raised with regard to the wider environment not being considered in the objectives. The improvement and enhancement of green space and biodiversity, limiting and adapting to climate change, reducing flood risk, minimising waste, improving land quality, improved water quality are not addressed. The strain on the police, hospital, fire service, schools and the general medical services was also raised. The Vision and listed Objectives suggest that the road access is adequate to serve a thriving airport and a major employment centre, this is not the case and amendments are required. The Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England and Leigh Town Council would like to see some minor amendments, however 59% responded ‘yes’ to this question.

**Question 3.3 – Are there any other additional objectives that might help to guide the selection of the preferred option/options and JAAP?**

Rebuilding of Bradwell nuclear power station and any wind farms was suggested. One representation stated that Southend Borough Council Core Strategy, Rochford District Council Local Plan, RSL Regeneration Framework, the East of England Plan and the Regional Economic Strategy all have statements about the objectives for the airport which could be added to give a clearer picture of the context. Separate objectives on transport, biodiversity, cultural heritage and management were recommended.

**Section 4.2 Issue 1: The future development and role of London Southend Airport**

Respondents included those who questioned why anything had to change at all, citing environmental concerns in particular as a reason for not developing the airport. Of the options put forward, views were mixed: some felt that low growth was the only sustainable option; others felt that medium growth was acceptable but high growth a step too far; some felt that greater expansion would be good for jobs and provide opportunities for the area.

**Question 4.1 – What do you see as the role of London Southend Airport in the future?**

52% envisaged a regional airport for internal UK and European flights and a catalyst for major employment and business growth. 6% recommended the airport be redeveloped for housing/other use while 28% suggested it should retain its current status.

**Question 4.2 – How can the airport best be developed to drive and support the local economy?**

Regenerating the area, infrastructure improvements, creating new jobs and offering access to other European destinations. Redevelopment to assist the entire community (hospitals/GPs/dentists) or another Lakeside retail/business park and sports complex.

**Section 4.3 Issue 2: The future of the JAAP as an employment area**

Mixed views about the future of the airport as an employment area. Concern expressed at the reliance on the aviation industry for employment.

**Question 4.3 – What role should the JAAP play in supporting wider employment growth in the sub-region?**

Providing cheaper business accommodation is an attraction. More advertising of Southend to European Countries, concentrating on the Olympics in 2012. Deliver many of the jobs required in the Regional Plan. Help shape the development, encourage support from business leaders, government, and market the great potential of growing the airport and improving road links.

**Question 4.4 – Is the area appropriate for significant growth in employment?**

62% stated 'yes' in response to the question providing local road improvements are carried out to support sustainability of such growth. Objections and 'no' comments were with regard to the current financial climate and lack of road infrastructure.

**Question 4.5 – Will the area be attractive to investors?**

78% of respondents stated 'yes' providing medium/high growth options were undertaken and improvements to infrastructure carried out. Concerns were raised with regard to the slowdown in aircraft industry and investors being put off by the limited potential to improve surrounding transport network.

**Question 4.6 – Are there additional options to consider?**

The replacement of the airport with a giant retail/business park was suggested. As was the use of the land for good quality leisure facilities. An underpass to replace the road closure at Eastwoodbury Lane was suggested.

**Section 4.4 Issue 3: Balancing development with environmental enhancement in the JAAP**

Concern expressed over environmental and health impacts of proposals to expand the airport. Some objected to the loss of Green Belt land. London Southend Airport claimed that the Green Belt boundary is arbitrary and does not relate to natural features.

**Question 4.7 – Should the Green Belt be considered for revision? If so how should it be revised?**

26% replied 'Yes' provided the revision does provide the retention of as much Green belt as possible. 59% did not want the greenbelt to be revised and thought it should be left as it is to protect residents' quality of life.



**Question 4.8 – What enhancements to the environment and amenity of the area should be made? What are the priority areas?**

Habitat enhancements such as planting of native hedgerows and tree belts, creation of green spaces as well as enhancement/creation of waterways, sustainable transport infrastructure such as improved public transport, cycle ways and footpaths to interlink airport buildings which makes travelling to and from the airport more accessible and environmentally friendly. Mitigation of noise impacts.

**Question 4.9 – What do you see as the greatest potential impact of development in the JAAP and how can it be mitigated?**

Main concerns relate to the volume of flights, noise (particularly from night flights) and air pollution, lack of transport links to/from the airport and the reduction of existing greenbelt land. Positive comments included 'put Southend firmly on the map' and improved employment in the area.

**Section 4.5 Issue 4: Transport and movement**

Southend Area Bus Users Group welcomes the proposed new station and suggest that the station incorporates a rail/bus interchange and that bus service operators are encouraged to divert their services to the proposed station. The need for a bypass for the A127 was expressed, as was concern at congestion and the current infrastructure.

**Question 4.10 What do you consider to be the transport priorities for the JAAP?**

A number of representations expressed the need to improve the current highway network - concern over congestion was a recurring theme. Importance of the need to move away from reliance on private car was stated. The implementation of a new rail station and access to it was a common priority. Improved public transport was seen as necessary. Impact of additional flights on residential amenity was also an issue raised.

**Question 4.11 How can a shift from car use to other modes of transport be achieved?**

Many respondents were sceptical that such a shift could ever be achieved, often citing convenience as the main reason why cars would always be the preferred choice of transport. Better public transport, such as a more reliable and frequent bus service was cited as a way to reduce car dependency. A door-to-door bus link such as the 'Stansted Flyer' was suggested. The

encouragement of cycling was put forward. A number of respondents suggested that better marketing and advertising of alternatives was required.

### **Section 4.6 Issue 5: JAAP 'Areas for Change'**

Concern was expressed at the level of development being proposed. Concern expressed over what impact the opening of the new car show rooms along Cherry Orchard Way may have on the highway network. Local amenity improvements questioned. It was noted that avionics technical advancement is consistently mentioned in the document with regard to potential noise and emission reductions, thereby not having a significant effect on the local area, but there is no proof of this.

### **Question 4.12 Do you agree with the proposed areas for change?**

Concern expressed about possible use of compulsory purchase. Many did agree with the proposed areas for change, but other felt that the green areas should be left undeveloped and that employment uses be directed to other brownfield sites. Environment Agency expressed concern regarding flood risk.

### **Question 4.13 Are there any areas that should be added or removed? Why?**

Objections to the development of Green Belt made. Suggestion of development for employment in alternative locations instead of the airport area. Many felt that the airport boundary should not be enlarged.

## **5.1 Introduction**

Minimum / no growth comments with concern drawn to increases in noise, traffic and pollution, and a medium growth comment. The sustainability aspect of the proposals should be included in the text with a clear link to the Sustainability Appraisal. Duplication of information should be avoided. The scenario diagrams should show the ownership of the land in question. The criticism was made that there is no 'no expansion' option in the report.

## **5.2 Scenario 1: Low Growth (do minimum)**

Comments suggested that airport activities would dwindle if growth is not achieved leading to a reduction in operations and thus employment. Concerns were expressed that industry would be discouraged from the area (in favour of areas with opportunities to expand). Low growth would also not benefit local sport and recreational facilities in the area. On the other hand, comments suggested that this was the only sustainable growth option with a

minimal negative impact; there should be no runway extension or development on Green Belt, adequate pollution control measures are required and any negative impacts such as increased traffic should be counteracted through infrastructure improvement in the surrounding area. However, it was noted that there is no 'no growth' scenario in the document, that the aviation industry is sensitive to economic impacts and growth goes against government targets for carbon dioxide reduction. Additionally part of Aviation Way Business Park is actually in Flood Zone 3. Southend Airport has commented that further evidence base work will be carried out at a later stage.

### **Section 5.2.1 Details**

Low growth would have the minimum amount of disruption and impact, but it would still have some impact, and there needs to be more environmental protection for residents. However, the MRO etc wouldn't grow in this scenario and the Brickworks site has not been identified for redevelopment. Other comments oppose any growth because of noise and pollution, the Green Belt should not be developed and it is the wrong time to expand. Southend Airport has commented that further evidence base work will be carried out at a later stage.

### **Section 5.2.2 Scenario Assessment**

One comment says that the scenario is acceptable; another says that low growth does not conform to policies e.g. the government's White Paper on airports or the East of England Plan. Another says that it is irresponsible to expand such a polluting industry.

### **Section 5.3 Scenario 2(a): Medium Growth**

This scenario may not attract aviation related business, and any negative impacts should be minimised and counteracted. Expansion would be a good opportunity providing employment and holiday opportunities, and associated infrastructure improvements; there is legislation to control the negative impacts. Others commented that the park and ride scheme is needed but more information is required, no expansion is preferred but some development is needed, the brickwork site should be developed, adequate pollution control measures are required, and with the business park extension to the North of Aviation Way there is the chance to achieve environmental enhancements. Westcliff Rugby Club has also recommended that "the playing fields and adjoining land north of the proposed employment extension should also be released from the Green Belt and safeguarded for potential future use". However, other comments state that minimal / no expansion is preferred because of noise, pollution, traffic, and environmental damage etc against reducing carbon dioxide emissions; it is irresponsible to expand a polluting industry. There should be no expansion of the airport perimeter or the runway.

Another comment says that option 3 is the only scenario to bring the proposed economic benefits to the area. Additionally part of Aviation Way Business Park is actually in flood zone 3. Southend Airport has commented that further evidence base work will be carried out at a later stage.

### **Section 5.3.1 Details**

There are concerns over noise pollution arising from this scenario. Appropriate provision should be made for bridleway users who will be affected by expansion of the airport. This scenario would increase employment and the vibrancy of the airport with acceptable impact; greater expansion would affect infrastructure, and cause noise and environmental damage. Southend Airport has commented that further evidence base work will be carried out at a later stage.

### **Section 5.3.2 Scenario Assessment**

One comment stated that this scenario will support employment without significant adverse impact on residents; an increase in employment without a proportional increase in noise. However another comment says there will be less green belt, more noise and more traffic thus a lower environmental quality. The needs of pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians should be considered and provisions made to counteract impact of development. Southend Airport comments that this scenario has a “high strategic fit with the objective of ensuring a high quality environment for residents”.

### **Question 5.4 Scenario 2(b): Medium Growth - 'Aviation Cluster'**

Most representations objected to Scenario 2(b). There are concerns over environment impact - noise pollution, air pollution, climate change issue, flood risk, change in green belt boundary, etc. Some suggested that the expansion of a polluting industry like aviation in an already overpopulated and congested area is irresponsible and unsustainable, and this will have detrimental and negative effect on most people living nearby. Moreover, some pessimistically think that the passenger forecast of 2 million is not achievable. There are also worries about inadequate road network, increasing fuel price, and runway configuration.

However, some do think this is a positive scenario - infrastructure improvements would encourage business to the area; employment opportunities will be enhanced, legislation to control the negative impacts; increased choice of holiday destinations.

### **Section 5.4.1 Details**

Only one support comment received and one other says the scenario is acceptable. All other representations are strongly objecting to the key features suggested in this scenario, especially on pollution, safety and Green Belt issues.

### **5.4.2 Scenario Assessment**

No support received. Concerns were raised with regard to the increased traffic and increased noise. Lack of information on noise level is also a concern. The probability of achieving the passenger forecasts is was questioned.

### **Section 5.5 Scenario 3: High Growth**

A number of respondents felt very passionately that the airport expansion should not go ahead, citing environmental concerns in particular. Noise, residential amenity and congestion were also frequently mentioned reasons why high-growth should not be favoured.

Other respondents suggested that the high-growth scenario was the only option that would see the economic potential of the airport realised and would lead to the airport being an asset for the region.

### **Section 5.5.1 Details**

Essex County Council notes the need to ensure that any scheme for the replacement of Eastwoodbury Lane includes sufficient off road provision for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.

There was some support from those that felt that this allowed for growth whilst protecting habitats. Others felt that the long-term harm would outweigh any benefits.

### **Section 5.5.2 Scenario Assessment**

Some support due to it being inline with national and regional policies, although support was subject to environmental issues being carefully monitored and enforced.

There were objections on the grounds of negative impact on the quality of life for residents.

## Questions 5.1 – 5.3

### Question 5.1 Which is your preferred Scenario for the future of the Southend Airport area?

#### Low Growth Scenario Comments Summary

The responses contained a combination of objections to any expansion and support for the low growth scenario. There were numerous concerns raised particularly with regard to the increase in noise levels, increase in air pollution, the volume of flights, increased road congestion, increased pressure on the local infrastructure - congestion on main routes and the rail network - thus exacerbating inherent problems, the impact on property prices, effect on green open spaces and the overall environmental impact. Other concerns arose about runway extension and the diversion of Eastwoodbury Lane for example increased traffic diverted onto the A127, and the impact on the quality of life of local residents and the wider community, and on community facilities such as local schools, the golf course and St Lawrence Church. Some comments also emphasised the proximity of London-Southend airport to other major airports in the region, thus questioning its deliverability, and that the proposed expansion should be considered within the current economic climate.

Several alternative suggestions for the airport were proposed, for example the creation of a new hospital on the site or the development of an organic argi-business.

Some respondents felt that more detail was required around the impacts of the proposed scenarios on and the benefits for, the wider community. The level of public awareness surrounding the consultation process itself was also questioned.

#### Medium Growth (2a) Scenario Comments Summary

Respondents were concerned with the release of Green Belt, noise pollution, infrastructure and the airport and passengers forecasts. Generally, they support the Medium growth scenario, and object to the expansion of a larger airport, as Stansted airport is only miles away. It is akin to one of the comments suggested – ‘significant improvements can be made to the airport and surrounding employment area to enable a large number of jobs to be created without the need to the release of Green Belt land’. Although some major airports are not many miles away from Southend, some suggested that Southend Airport can take some pressure off these airports, and could benefit the local area in different aspects.

#### Medium Growth (2b) Scenario Comments Summary

Respondents were mainly concerned with the environmental impact and infrastructure improvement. Some had concerns regarding the locations of

Southend Airport. Others suggested some increase in capacity could be beneficial but strict control will be necessary.

### High Growth Scenario Comments Summary

This Scenario is supported by various organisations, including Ford Motor Company, Chamber of Trade and Commerce, EEDA, Westcliff Rugby Football Club, St. Lawrence Church. The economic benefit was the main reason for support, but other issues including the possibility of infrastructure improvements and the potential to deliver an airport that would offer a variety of travel destinations.

Many respondents believed Scenario 3 to be the only option that would make London Southend Airport a commercially attractive package, and could bring wealth and employment to the region. They highlighted the benefits of economic activities and job opportunities being created.

Some respondents would like to see Southend Airport become a fully functional regional airport, easing the pressure for the main hubs and giving an alternative airport for Essex residents to travel from.

For the negative issues like noise pollution that many other concern, the Essex Chamber of Trade & Commerce suggested research shows that modern planes are now designed to be more fuel efficient and make less noise actually need longer runways to operate than the current generation of planes that are noisier and less fuel efficient, suggesting that this could mean that Scenario 2b is actually noisier than Scenario 3.

Despite some support, the majority of respondents were opposed to Scenario 3. There was significant opposition to Scenario 3, particularly, but not exclusively, from members of the public. Objections centred around concerns over environmental impact, noise, pollution, impact on residential amenity, deliverability and inadequacy of infrastructure to cope with the proposed growth. The proximity of residential areas and current levels of congestion were often cited as reasons why Scenario 3 is not viable. Others representations stated that comparisons with Southampton airport were misleading given the two airport's differing circumstances, particularly with regards to highway connections.

### **Question 5.2 How could your preferred scenario be further enhanced?**

Comments included those stressing the need for improved public transport, including the implementation of a shuttle bus and / or park and ride scheme. The need to improve highway infrastructure was also frequently stated.

A number of responses suggested that the land by used for something completely different that would benefit local communities.

The potential to include residential development was cited by certain parties.

### **Question 5.3 Are there any other scenarios which you feel have not been considered?**

Views were split: some favoured no airport expansion and wished to see the land developed for an alternative use (the potential to use the land for sustainable employment uses was suggested, Rochford's housing requirement was also cited); whilst others thought that expansion would be good for the area.

### **Section 6.1 The process for preparing the JAAP**

A number of objections from GO East: concerns overly the realism of some of the elements of the high-growth option; suggest that the JAAP should perhaps not be putting forward any options or scenarios, especially those relating to the expansion of the airport, that may be wholly unrealistic given the environmental constraints that exist in respect of the land within the plan boundaries and indeed beyond these; question whether it will be possible to mitigate some of the negative impacts of the high-growth option as stated; question whether the JAAP plan area has the environmental capacity to accommodate the growth in passenger numbers envisaged in the high-growth scenario; note that employment growth may be possible without expansion of the airport itself; the JAAP should include more detail on delivery.

Comments from other respondents expressed concern over lack of information on the impact of proposals on air quality, transport infrastructure and quality of life.

### **Section 6.2 Sending in your views**

Concern was expressed that questions were duplicated and that this may deter people from responding. Concerns were expressed over the perceived lack of communication and lack of opportunity to comment. Concern was also expressed that consultation was uneven, with Rochford District Council doing more to inform residents than Southend Borough Council.

### **End of document.**