

EASTLEIGH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE

Thursday, 25 March 2021 (10:00 am – 11:59 pm)

Friday 26 March 2021 (6pm – 8:30pm)

PRESENT:

Councillor Campbell (Chairman); Councillors Bourne, Bicknell, Clarke, Doguie, Irish, Mann and Tyson-Payne

---

RESOLVED ITEMS (SUBJECT TO QUESTIONS ONLY)

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bicknell declared that he is a member of Southampton International Airport Consultative Committee. The Committee is not a committee of the Council and its role is to help provide a forum for discussing airport-related issues with those who may be affected. He declared he had taken advice and that his membership of the consultative committee did not conflict with his role as a local councillor at ELAC today.

For total transparency, Councillor Bicknell also declared that he holds a nominal number of shares in one of the airlines proposing to fly out of the airport. He had taken advice and this was not a disclosable pecuniary interest. Neither will it influence his participation today as an elected councillor of Eastleigh Borough Council, taking into account what is said and contained within the officer's report.

2. PRESENTATION ON PLANNING GUIDELINES

The Head of Housing and Development gave a short presentation on guidelines that had to be taken into account when determining planning applications; in particular the issues that could, and could not, be taken into account. This was set against the broader policy framework.

3. PLANNING APPLICATION - SOUTHAMPTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, MITCHELL WAY, EASTLEIGH, SOUTHAMPTON, SO18 2HG

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Housing and Development (Agenda item 4) concerning a planning application at Southampton International Airport, Mitchell Way, Eastleigh, Southampton, SO18 2HG for construction of a 164 metre runway extension at the northern end of the existing runway, associated blast screen to the north of the proposed runway extension, removal of existing bund and the reconfiguration and extension of existing long stay car parking to the east and west of Mitchell Way to provide additional long stay spaces. (Ref: F/19/86707).

The Committee was updated that:

- An additional circa 277 letters of representation were received, of which 222 were in support of the development and 52 were against. The points expressed both for / against were set out in the public representation section of the report already – no substantive new matters had been raised.
- Natural England – no objection to Appropriate Assessment subject to clarification around long term maintenance and management of sustainable drainage serving the car park and runway extension.
- Recommendation - remained to Permit with added qualification within the “subject to” of (2) the conditions set out below with delegated authority to make minor amendments to the conditions to ensure they dovetail with, and do not duplicate with, the section 106 agreement;
- Revised conditions - no.3 (construction controls), no.4 (dust management), no.6 (underground services), no.8 (car park completion), no.13 (rollout of fixed ground electrical power), no.20 (drainage).
- Conditions moved to S106 Agreement – no.9 (night flights), unnumbered condition (ATMs between 0600-0700), no.10 engine testing, no.11 (Reverse thrust), no.12 (noise cap contour), no.21 (Biodiversity Environmental Management Plan).
- Para. 12 - A Sensitivity Test of alternative operations was submitted in July 2020 (with ESA) and not October 2020.
- Para. 673 – “Further mitigation to be secured via a Section 106 Agreement includes a Noise Insulation Policy (NIP), a noise contour cap, restrictions on night-time flights, a cap on “**vehicle movements**”, and not a cap on “**passenger numbers**”.

After 14 hours, The Committee adjourned the meeting at midnight on 25 March 2021 until Friday 26 March 2021 at 6pm when it recommenced.

A recorded vote occurred:

FOR: Councillors - Bicknell; Bourne; and Mann.

AGAINST: Councillors – Campbell (Chair); Clarke; Doguie; Irish; and Tyson- Payne.

(FOR: 3; AGAINST: 5)

**RESOLVED -**

1. **On 25-26 March the Eastleigh Local Area Committee (ELAC) resolved to not support the recommendation of the Head of**

**Housing and Development to permit the planning application. The Council and Committee Procedure Rules (Standing Orders) (Part 4 of the Constitution) details the process to follow for Planning Applications (Appendix A page 4-25). Of relevance is paragraph (f) part (ii). In summary this states that for a development which has “borough-wide significance” and where the Local Area Committee wishes to take a decision contrary to the recommendation of the Head of Housing & Development shall be determined by Full Council.**

2. **In not supporting the recommendation to approve the development, ELAC members expressed concerns in regard to increased air traffic movements (ATMs) and resultant impact of emissions on the climate, the increased impact of noise on the community and impact of additional vehicular movement on the highway.**

(NOTES: Councillors had a lengthy debate citing concerns about environmental impact, climate change, noise pollution, increased traffic and the climate change and environmental emergency declaration.

Approximately 58 people spoke in objection to the application, citing concerns including – but not limited to - air quality and pollution, climate change, increase in air traffic, noise disruption, lesson disruption in schools, CO2 emissions, road traffic increases, ecological impact, parking, impact on health and wellbeing, tree felling, economical impact on Bournemouth Airport, unnecessary expansion and wider transport network pressure.

In the region of 60 people spoke in support of the application, citing – but not limited to -economic prosperity, income and job improvements after Covid 19, benefit to local businesses, increased transport links, benefits to the Channel Islands, rebuilding local businesses after the pandemic, concerns around loss of airport if it cannot be financially viable, conjunction with Freeport, reduction of internal road travel, environmental benefits of using local airports, increased travel destinations and that planes of the same size already operate from and to the airport but with reduced capacity due to the length of runway.)

M6818