

**DRAFT**

**STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 APRIL 2017 AT ENTERPRISE HOUSE,  
STANSTED AIRPORT**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Chairman – Stewart Ashurst\***

**Users of Airport**

**Freight interests (1) – David Leigh**

**Passenger airline companies (2) Chris Hughes**

**Business passengers (1) - Peter Odrich\***

**Passengers with (or with an interest in) restricted mobility - (1) Peter Lainson\***

**Non Business passengers (1) Julie Jones**

**Local authorities**

**Braintree District Council (1) – Hylton Johnson\***

**East Hertfordshire District Council (1) – Gary Jones**

**Epping Forest District Council (1) - Mary Sartin\***

**Essex County Council (1) – Ricki Gadsby**

**Harlow District Council (1) – Danny Purton\***

**Hertfordshire County Council (1) – Graham McAndrew\***

**Uttlesford District Council (1) - Keith Artus\***

**Organisations with a locality interest**

**Environmental interests (1) – Richard Burrett**

**Hertfordshire Association of Local and Parish Councils - Angela Alder \***

**Stop Stansted Expansion (1) - Brian Ross\***

**Commerce and Business interests (1) – Haydon Yates\***

**Tourism interests (1) – Keith Brown**

**Surface transport interests (1) – Rufus Barnes\***

**Uttlesford Association of Local Councils (1) - Jackie Cheetham**

**(\* present)**

**Also present at the meeting**

**Frank Evans - Secretary and Technical Adviser to STACC\***

## **Representing Stansted Airport Limited (STAL)**

**Andrew Cowan - Chief Executive Officer\***

**Chris Wiggan - Head of External Affairs \***

**Neil Robinson - Corporate Responsibility Director\***

**Martin Lyall - Transformation Director\***

**Daniel Gallo - Customer Services & Security Director\***

**Alistair Andrew - MAG\***

## **Representing Border Force**

**Sally Bray - UK Border Force Stansted Airport**

## **AGENDA**

### **1. New Members, Apologies and Deputising Attenders**

- i. Apologies had been received from David Leigh, Richard Burrett, Gary Jones, Julie Jones, Keith Brown and Jackie Cheetham.

### **2. Public Question Time**

**Mr Michael Belcher (Burton Bury, Burton End Stansted Essex) asked the following question:-**

*“ This is a follow up to the question on Part 1 compensation tabled at the June 2016 STACC meeting in respect of which a written answer was sent by STAL in February of this year.*

*Since it is unlikely that STAL has copied its response to members of this Committee, here is a brief resume of the issue:*

*Over many years STAL made representations to this Committee and to the public at large that local residents could not claim compensation under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 (“the Act”) until all the works approved in 1999 had been completed. Please refer to the minutes of STACC meetings in October 2009 and July 2010 for details of such statements.*

*During these same years many local residents sold their properties without submitting compensation claims because they relied on what STAL had told both them and their professional advisors and believed they did not have any entitlement to claim.*

*Those statements made by STAL have now turned out to be incorrect and, according to STAL’s latest publicly stated position, local residents were in fact entitled to claim compensation from 2002 onwards.*

*In its February 2017 letter (a copy of which is attached) STAL has said that anyone who sold their property during this period without first submitting a compensation claim can no longer claim as they do not have a “qualifying interest” under the Act.*

*In effect STAL made representations about the legal position under the Act which were wrong and it now seeks to rely on the Act to avoid its responsibility to redress the situation. The effect of all this is that many local residents have been denied their legal entitlement to claim compensation. A number of such residents have subsequently died without ever receiving the compensation to which they were potentially entitled.*

*The question addressed to members of this Committee is what do they think of the representations made by STAL on this issue to this Committee and to the wider public over the*

*years, and do they think it is fair that STAL, by taking a purely legal stance on this important matter, should seek to avoid its moral and social responsibility?"*

In response, the Chairman made the following statement:-

*" I am not an executive chairman in the sense of a chief executive officer. I simply chair these meetings and oversee the work of the Committee. In this response therefore, I can only seek to express what I believe would be a view commanding the support of a majority of the Committee.*

*STACC has neither sought to be involved - nor ever thought it right to be involved in the land compensation issues referred to in Mr Belcher's question. This has particularly been the case in respect of any negotiations about compensation issues - or related matters of law - concerning any interest of an individual group of individuals including the resolution of any one claim or set of claims.*

*STACC's concern has simply been that there should be a purposeful process for resolving these matters and that the process should be conducted as expeditiously as possible given what obviously is a very intricate, complex matter and the understandable concerns of the individuals affected. STACC has been pleased to note that within the last year or so, the pace towards resolving these complex matters does appear to have quickened*

*Given STACC's non involvement in the detailed substance of the overall subject, the particular issue referred to in Mr Belcher's question is not one on which the Committee can usefully comment. STACC would expect however that the individuals affected and their advisers have considered whether in the position outlined - and believed to be accurate by Mr Belcher - the legal principle of estoppel and its implications might apply. Whether this principle or any moral or social obligation referred to by Mr Belcher might apply is a matter rather for STAL and the company's advisers to consider."*

One Member of the Committee disagreed with the Chairman's statement. He noted that the issue had been discussed by STACC in the past. There was concern about the time taken to resolve the issue and the high costs faced by claimants in seeking to resolve individual cases.

**((NB. The Chairman has subsequently acknowledged that any inaccuracy in this response will need to be corrected by the next meeting of STACC))**

### **3. Minutes**

The Committee **APPROVED** as a correct record the draft Minutes of the STACC Committee meeting held on 25 January 2017.

### **4. Border Force**

The BF updated the Committee on recent developments. Recent events had meant that priority of BF's work was now focussed on counter terrorism and the security of UK borders. Despite this, BF were managing to meet SLAs for queuing times most of the time.

Usage of e-gates continued to be high - figures for March were that 83% of eligible passengers were using the gates.

Members of UEG had undertaken a behind the scenes visit to BF. This had been particularly welcome and helped Members gain a better appreciation of the totality of BF's work.

## **5. Customer Service Strategy**

The AMT updated the Committee on recent developments. ASQ results were encouraging as they demonstrated that the airport was gaining improved ratings from passengers. A number of factors had contributed to this. This included improved wifi provision; reduced queuing times for security and better check in facilities

It had taken longer than anticipated to establish the Programme Board but the first meeting would be taking place shortly. UEG had been invited to sit on the Board.

A new PRM area offering more space and privacy for PRM passengers was under construction and was expected to open shortly, The involvement of the Committee's PRM adviser had been welcome.

The new Crowd Vision facility was currently being tested and was expected to be fully installed in the next two to three weeks. It would be used in the Check in and Security areas as well Immigration. This would help passengers have a better and more accurate appreciation of queuing times rather than simply relying on their own perception.

## **6. Working Groups : Reports of meeting**

**The Committee RECEIVED and ENDORSED** the Minutes and Notes of the following Working Group meetings since the January meeting

### **i. Environmental Issues Group - 22 February**

The main issues considered by the Group included action over the Clacton route. It was planned that the Committee should write to the CAA as part of the post implementation review of the switch of traffic from the Dover to the Clacton route. The Group had opposed the original NATS proposal. The Group had been exploring with NATS the possibility of forced vectoring before writing to the CAA.

On the PBN trials, it was disappointing that Ryanair was still not participating fully in the trial . Whilst the trial had been a success, it was important not to overstate this given the non participation of the airport's major operator.

It was noted that a number of local authorities were involved in clean air initiatives. These included greater use of electric vehicles. It would be helpful to develop a dialogue with the airport management on this issue.

## ii. User Experience Group - 1 February and 29 March 2017

The development of the Customer Service Strategy remained a key priority and the Group were grateful that they would be represented on the Programme Board. It was recognised that if the Strategy were to be successfully developed, it was vital that key stakeholders should be fully engaged and it would be a key challenge for the airport to establish effective relationships with stakeholders. It was noted that UEG had planned to commission research related to the strategy. However the delay in developing the strategy had meant that this research had not been commissioned.

The Group had visited Birmingham airport and attended a meeting of the consultative committee. They had also had a helpful discussion on PRM procedures at the airport. It was planned to visit Manchester airport before the end of the financial year.

The Group had welcomed the changes in the Express Set Down facility - in particular the reduction in the level of the fine to £25 from £50. It was also welcomed that the arrangements for local residents remained unchanged. It was noted that there had been some problems with the pay machines. The airport management advised that there had been some software issues which were currently being rectified.

## 7. Airport CEO's report

The Committee **RECEIVED** the quarterly report. The main issues to emerge in discussion were:-

- Passenger numbers and cargo volumes continued to grow. The quarter had seen the introduction of operations by Jet2 and Jet2holidays ;
- Outline planning approval for the proposed Arrivals Hall had been granted by Uttlesford District Council. It was planned to engage with UEG in the design of the hall. Members had already raised issues about the segregation of domestic and international passengers; the need to avoid conflicting passenger flows in the Departures terminal and how developments would affect TTS operations.
- The level of complaints had increased mainly as a result of the switch in traffic from the Dover to Clacton routes. There were a number of multiple complainants. The AMT sought to liaise with these complainants and in number of cases had invited them into the airport to discuss their concerns in number of cases.
- There had been a criminal security breach when a group of protestors cut through a section of the airport's perimeter fence and chained themselves to a Home Office deportation flight. Following the incident, consideration was being given as to whether Stansted should continue to be used for deportation flights in the future.
- In early February, funding had been secured for a new on-airport Technical and Professional Skills Centre following Government confirmation of the latest investment into the South East LEP Local Growth Fund. The application, made by Harlow College and supported by STAL and Essex County Council, will see an £11 million skills centre delivered north side to meet the skills gap in aircraft engineering, logistics and customer service.
- Public transport usage had increased from 51.17% in 2015 to 51.91% in 2016, with Stansted remaining the number one airport in the UK for public transport mode share.

- In terms of transport there was a need to ensure that surface access to the airport kept stride with airport growth.
- Members noted that there was a lack of rail services during the night and that this might be an issue covered by a future Abelio presentation to the Committee. It was also noted that rail maintenance schedules and the lack of four track were constraints to an improvement of the existing service.
- As regards buses It was suggested that the Transport Forum tended to focus on north/south services. Developments in and around Harlow with a consequent growth in population now meant that there was a need to improve east/west services along the A414 corridor on a sustainable basis. The airport commented that there were good services east of the airport but routes to the west were difficult. However they were happy to work with coach operators and there might be subsidy funds available. It was also recognised that there was a need for reliable bus services with passengers being able to use bus services at any time.
- Members asked that future Public Transport Rate statistics should have a time breakdown. This would help determine whether the majority of passengers arriving during the night came by coach.
- It was noted that there had been a number of articles in the media about possible property developments. These did not appear to have been reported to the Committee. The Airport advised that property developers frequently contacted them about possible developments. A number of these were speculative and it would not be appropriate to disclose such approaches.

## **8. Future Developments**

The AMT gave a presentation (copy attached) on future developments. Given the growth in traffic, there needed to be sufficient airside infrastructure to support such growth. Other developments were needed eg car parking and hotels. It was noted that the new hotel was planned to be opened in July.

## **9. Noise and airspace policy developments**

The AMT gave a short presentation on noise and airspace developments (copy attached). This provided detail as to the PBN trials. These had been successful and it was planned to extend to further routes. The presentation was welcomed by the Committee and it was agreed that it would be helpful to have similar presentations at future meetings.

## **10. Appointment of new STACC Chairman**

It was reported that 92 applications had been received. This had been reduced to a short list of 5 candidates. The Appointments Panel would be interviewing these candidates in the first week of May with the aim of shortlisting 2 candidates for interview the following week.

## **11. STACC Constitution**

The Chairman had prepared a paper covering two issues covering the need for a Deputy Chairman and expanding membership of the Committee. It was agreed that these issues should be considered once a new Chairman was in place.

## **12. Date of Next Meeting**

Members noted that the next meeting of the Committee will be held on 28th June 2017.

**Stansted Airport Consultative Committee  
May 2017**