

# STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Secretariat

E-mail contact: [fefamily@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto:fefamily@blueyonder.co.uk)

website: [www.stacc.info](http://www.stacc.info)

---

## AGENDA

<b>Group</b>	<b>STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE</b>	<b>Venue</b>	Enterprise House, Stansted Airport
<b>Date</b>	Wednesday 31 July 2013	<b>Meeting room</b>	Challenger 1
<b>time</b>	2.00pm	<b>Secretary</b>	<b>Frank Evans</b>

---

*Can any Members unable to attend please let the Secretary know, if possible by 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday, 30 July. There will be a pre meeting buffet in Enterprise House for Committee members only from about 1.00 p.m. Can you please identify yourself at the Reception Desk, where an escort to the buffet will be arranged?*

*Car parking is available in the Enterprise House **staff** car park from 12.30 pm onwards.*

*To gain entry, upon arrival at that car park please indicate on the intercom that you are attending the STACC meeting and the control room staff will raise the barrier for you.*

*This facility is also available to the public attending the meeting. No entry will be possible after 2 00 pm.*

*Please do not go along the road beyond the staff car park entrance or attempt to get past the security barrier on that road.*

*Can any Members unable to attend please let the Secretary know in advance*

## AGENDA

### 1. Apologies for absence and substitute attenders

Councillor Gary Jones and Councillor Paul Schroder

### 2. New Members

The Committee is invited to welcome new members as follows:

Keith Brown (Chief Executive Officer, Visit East Anglia) replacing Peter Cansick;

Councillor Rodney Bass (Essex County Council) replacing Gerard McEwen;

Councillor Paul Schroder (Harlow Council) replacing Tony Durcan; and

Councillor Graham McAndrew (Hertfordshire County Council) replacing John Barfoot.

### **3. Public Question Time**

Three Public Questions have been received

#### **Mrs Irene Jones**

*“Heathrow Airport is allowed less than half the number of night flights allowed at Stansted. At London City Airport all flights are banned between 10pm and 6.30am and for 24 hours over Saturday to Sunday, 12.30pm to 12.30pm. No flights are allowed on Bank Holidays.*

*Would the new owners of Stansted please consider giving some further respite to local residents by adding further restrictions to the number of flights at night, or better still, give us a 24 hour no flying break over the weekend.”*

#### **Mr Douglas Kent** - Technical and Research Director, Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings

*“The Stansted area is remarkable, above all, for its exceptionally fine heritage of old buildings, coupled with a landscape that remains significantly unspoilt, creating an environment that represents the very best of England. This fundamental blockage to expansion at Stansted has been central to previous public inquiries and one that your basic research prior to acquiring the airport should have identified. You can imagine the astonishment of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), therefore, when MAG's pro-Stansted expansion media release of 19th July made no reference to the unique legacy of historic buildings within the district surrounding the airport. Given the unparalleled contribution of historic buildings to the character of the environment here compared to that around other airports and the fact that harm to historic buildings and their settings would be much harder to avoid, how could you state that the "environmental impacts of building new capacity at Stansted are likely to be far less than at other locations" and what assurance can you give that you won't perpetuate this misconception in any future pronouncements?”*

#### **Mr John Pryor**

*“Should Stansted be given permission to become a four runway airport, how much will it cost taxpayers to provide the necessary infrastructure to enable it to operate?”*

### **4. Minutes**

To approve the attached draft minutes of the Committee meeting held on 24 April 2013.

### **5. Matters arising**

All outstanding actions recorded in the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 April will be dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

## **6. Airport Management Report**

To note the attached Management Report and Traffic Statistics. (*The Davies Commission, terminal rationalisation plans and car parking will be considered as separate items on the agenda*).

## **7. Working Groups: reports of meetings**

To note the Minutes and Notes of the following Working Group meetings held since the April STACC meeting:

- i. Environmental Issues Group on 8 May (Notes attached)
- ii. User Experience Group held on 12 June (Minutes attached).
- iii. Corporate Affairs Group held on 29 May (Minutes attached)

The Working Group Chairmen will amplify as appropriate any issues raised in the above meetings. (*NB the issues of the Davies Commission, terminal rationalisation and car parking will be considered as separate agenda items below.*)

## **8. Financial Matters and Committee Arrangements**

To consider the attached report from the Chairman

## **9. Davies Commission**

(a) To note the attached response prepared on behalf of the Committee by the Corporate Affairs Group and submitted to the Commission before the deadline set for responses.

(b) consider MAG's attached responses to the Commission relating to future short, medium and long term capacity issues at Stansted including any amplification by the Airport Management Team at the meeting.

(c) To ask EIG to consider the Commission's recent discussion paper on noise

([https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/223764/airports-commission-noise.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/223764/airports-commission-noise.pdf) ) and the scope of a draft response.

## **10. Terminal Redevelopment Project**

To consider an Airport Management Team update about the emerging proposals for the redevelopment of the terminal.

## **11. Parking**

To consider an Airport Management Team update about parking developments including the express set down arrangements.

## **12. Government consultations**

To note the attached Note from the Secretary

## **13. Annual Meeting of the Liaison Group of UK Airport Consultative Committees**

To receive a Note from the Secretary summarising the main issues discussed at the recent UKACCS meeting in Edinburgh.

**14. Date of Next Meeting**

Members may wish to note that the final meeting of the year will be held on 30/10/13.

# **ATTACHMENTS**

## **AGENDA ITEM 4**

### **STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

#### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 24 APRIL 2013 AT ENTERPRISE HOUSE STANSTED AIRPORT**

#### **ATTENDANCE**

**Chairman** – Stewart Ashurst\*

#### **Users of Airport**

Freight interests (1) – David Leigh\*

Passenger airline companies (2) TBA

Business passengers (1) - Peter Odrich\*

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

Non Business passengers (1) Olivia Vandyk\*

#### **Local authorities**

Braintree District Council (1) – Julian Swift

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

Epping Forest District Council (1) - Mary Sartin

Essex County Council (1) - Gerard McEwen

Harlow District Council (1) – Tony Durcan

Hertfordshire County Council (1) - John Barfoot\*

Uttlesford District Council (1) - Jackie Cheetham\*

#### **Organisations with a locality interest**

Environmental interests (1) – Carly Leonard\*

East Herts Association of Local Councils (1) - TBA

NWEEHPA (1) - Brian Ross\*

Commerce and Business interests (1) – David Burch\*

Tourism interests (1) - TBA

Surface transport interests (1) – Rufus Barnes\*

Uttlesford Association of Local Councils (1) - Keith Artus\*

(\* present)

#### **Also present at the meeting**

Ms Z Oates, Essex County Council\*

Mr M Peachey Adviser\*

Mr S Bailes Adviser\*

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

Mr A Harrison	Managing Director
Mr W Parkes	Communications Director
Mr M Lyall	Operations Director
Mr C Wiggan	Head of Public Affairs and Sustainable Development

Secretariat  
Frank Evans                      Secretary and Technical Adviser to the Committee

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTE ATTENDERS**

Apologies for absence had been received from Mary Sartin (represented by Councillor Gary Waller) Gerard McEwen, Julian Swift and Antony Durcan.

### **2. NEW MEMBERS**

- (i) Since the last meeting of the Committee, Stansted Airport had been acquired by the Manchester Airports Group (MAG). With effect from 28 February 2013, MAG had taken over the management and operation of the airport. The Chairman paid tribute to Nick Barton (the outgoing Managing Director) and it was agreed that a farewell letter of appreciation should be sent to Mr Barton. The Chairman then welcomed Andrew Harrison – the new Managing Director and expressed the wish that STACC should continue to work with the airport management in its Committee role as a critical friend.
- (ii) The Committee endorsed the appointments of David Burch (Director of Policy at the Essex Chambers of Commerce) as a Commerce and Business Interests representative in place of Kim Sainsbury and of Carly Leonard (Executive Director – Sustainability East) representing Environmental Interests.
- (iii) The Chairman reported that now that Peter Cansick had retired from ABTA he had also decided to resign from the Committee. The Committee expressed their gratitude for Mr Cansick's years of valuable service and agreed that the Chairman should write a letter of appreciation to him. The Chairman reported that he had received two expressions of interest in the vacancy – one from Keith Brown (Chief Executive Officer - Visit East Anglia) and the other from Julie Jones (Senior Member Services Manager – ABTA). After references to their respective cvs and careful consideration it was agreed that Mr Brown should be invited to join the Committee. ABTA's wish to be involved with the Committee was noted.
- (iv) The Chairman also advised that he was currently seeking to secure a Passenger Airline representative on the Committee. He had been in contact with Ian Clayton (Ryanair) who was the current chairman of the Stansted

Airlines Consultative Committee. It had been agreed that Mr Clayton should initially attend the July STACC meeting as an observer.

### **3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No Public Questions had been received.

### **4. MINUTES OF STACC MEETING HELD ON 30 JANUARY 2013**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 30 January were approved by the Committee as a correct record.

### **5. MATTERS ARISING**

All outstanding actions recorded in the Minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2013 were referred to elsewhere on the agenda.

### **6. NOTES OF WORKING GROUP MEETINGS**

#### **(a) Environmental Issues Group**

The Notes of the EIG meeting held on 13 February 2013 were received by the Committee. In reviewing the Notes, the attention of the Committee was drawn to two particular matters. First, –the start of the proposed trials to establish additional waypoints had been brought forward to the beginning of May as opposed to June. Second, there continued to be close liaison between STAL and EIG on the development of the Annual Sustainability Report. The EIG Chairman and the STACC Secretary and Technical Adviser had met the external auditors about upstream involvement of the EIG in the Report's future formulation. The report (which the Committee was very pleased to note was available at the meeting) would be discussed at the May EIG meeting.

#### **(b) User Experience Group**

The Minutes of the UEG meeting held on 13 March 2013 were received by the Committee. In reviewing the Minutes, the Committee noted the ongoing positive liaison between the Group and Bill Form (UKBA). However Mr Form would be retiring in the summer and the Committee agreed it was important that his successor should maintain the existing open and very cooperative approach. At its June meeting, the Group would be considering STAL's review of the discount scheme for express set down parking – in particular its impact on local public transport services. The last meeting had reviewed PRM facilities and the UEG Chairman paid tribute to the key participation of Peter Lainson. This had highlighted several issues including the lack of sheltered accommodation in the express set down area and the failure of the help button in the disabled toilet at the bus station. However the UEG Chairman

noted that the airport had quickly responded to these issues – a new helpdesk would be provided in the bus station and the fault with the emergency help button had been rectified. A further update on PRM facilities would be provided at the June meeting of the Group. The UEG Chairman reiterated the key aim of the Group which was to provide added value.

## **7. GOVERNMENT AND OTHER CONSULTATIONS**

The Committee received an introductory paper from the Secretary and Technical Adviser about the following three issues:-

### **(i) Davies Commission on airport capacity;**

The Airports Commission had been tasked with the production of two reports on future options for UK airport capacity - an interim report by the end of 2013 and a final report in the summer 2015. The Commission had issued a number of discussion papers on various issues including climate change and demand forecasting. It was proposed that STACC should make a submission to the Commission, focussing on the key issue of UK airport capacity - especially the future needs of London and the South East. The closing date for submissions was 19 July. It was proposed that CAG should be asked to prepare a draft response. Given that the Commission's deadline fell before the July meeting of STACC, the Committee accepted that a response would probably need to be agreed by correspondence. The Secretary would advise members of the date for the CAG meeting – probably towards the end of May. All STACC members would be invited to attend.

As SSE had already made submissions to the Commission, the Chairman invited Brian Ross to present a view of the main capacity issues (from an SSE perspective) and which could help to inform the Committee's own deliberations on the subject. SSE had recently submitted a paper on demand forecasting to the Commission (copies had been made available to Members). It was noted that in SSE's view there was no capacity crisis. In 2012, UK airports handled around 2m passenger air transport movements - a minimal increase (0.28%) over 2001 whereas passenger throughput over the same period had increased by 22%. This meant that a significant increase in passenger numbers had been accommodated without a corresponding major increase in aircraft movements. Mr Ross maintained therefore that the issue of future airport capacity should be addressed in demand terms of aircraft movements rather than passenger numbers. It was also noted that Stansted Airport was currently operating at around half the capacity allowed under its local planning permissions. SSE's view was that this all indicated that there was no current market demand for a 2<sup>nd</sup> runway at Stansted in the foreseeable future.

It was also noted that the airport's business plan was not dependent on the provision of a second runway. The airport would be making a submission to the Commission in due course. Outside the issue of demand at Stansted, other considerations for the airport would likely be the effect of maintaining a single hub at Heathrow upon other airports in the Manchester Airports Group as well as the overall impact of capacity options on regional airports in the Group.

It was also noted that the Commission would be issuing a paper on noise in the summer.

## **(ii) Night Noise Consultation**

The Committee agreed that the final draft response – which had been amended to reflect further views received from members – should be sent to the Department of Transport. It was noted that as the aircraft fleet at Stansted was predominantly modern, any environmental improvements were more likely to be achieved through the development of operational procedures rather than the introduction of new, quieter aircraft. The response also highlighted the need for supplementary metrics especially relating to areas such as Stansted where there were low ambient noise levels.

## **(iii) The Aviation Policy Framework**

The Committee noted the recent publication of the Government's policy framework which would be used to inform the work of the Airports Commission. The Committee was disappointed to note that the framework did not significantly change existing policy or propose action to mitigate the environmental impact on communities living around airports. In particular there was no guidance on possible supplementary metrics which would address deficiencies in the present system. There was reference to alternative measures being developed locally but there was no central guidance as to how these might be achieved. The lack of central guidance could lead to issues of inconsistency across UK airports.

## **8. AIRPORT MANAGEMENT REPORT AND PRESENTATION**

The Committee noted the STAL Management Report amplified at the meeting by the STAL Managing Director. Mr Harrison then presented MAG's vision for the future development of the airport (copy attached). This emphasised MAG's wish to see growth at the airport, adding 5m additional passengers by 2018; improving the passenger experience by remodelling the terminal and developing a greater choice of car park options.

In discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- The airport wished to be seen as having a positive impact on the area. For example, pro active engagement with the local community was a key factor. By way of example, MAG had worked closely with one of the most deprived Manchester areas (Wythenshawe) on a number of projects. Consideration would need to be given to what was the most appropriate approach for Stansted. At Manchester, the airport maintained a regular, proactive presence at local libraries which over time had helped to reduce the number of complaints.
- There was a need for a greater range of car parking options. There were concerns about the recently introduced express set down facility.
- The issue of the houses acquired by BAA need to be resolved. In particular there needed to be a clear timetable for disposal. The airport management were aware of the local concern and undertook to address the issue.

- The importance the airport attached to sustainability was welcomed. It was noted that good co-operation existed between the airport and the Committee as evidenced through the liaison over the production of the airport's sustainability report.
- It was noted that the latest traffic statistics indicated an increase in night flights. The airport undertook to provide clarification for the increase.

## **9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Chairman noted that Councillor Gerard McEwen would not be standing at the forthcoming local County Council elections. As a result, Councillor McEwen would be standing down from STACC. The Chairman paid tribute to the positive and helpful role that Councillor McEwen had played in STACC over a number of years. It was agreed that the Chairman should formally write to Councillor McEwen expressing the Committee's appreciation of his long and valuable service.

## **10. NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the next STACC meeting of the year would take place on 31 July.

**STACC Secretariat**  
**April 2013**

## **AGENDA ITEM 7**

### **NOTE OF MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES GROUP HELD AT STANSTED AIRPORT ON 8 MAY 2013**

#### **Attendees**

Keith Artus (Chairman)

Steve Bailes

Zhanine Oates

Mary Sartin

Carly Leonard

Also present: Chris Wiggan (STAL), Duncan Smith (STAL), Kathy Morrissey (STAL) and Frank Evans (Secretary).

#### **1. Apologies for absence**

Apologies had been received from Stewart Ashurst, Martin Peachey, Councillor Jackie Cheetham and Anthony Durcan.

#### **2. Membership**

The Group welcomed Carly Leonard (Sustainability East) as a new member. The Group also recorded a note of appreciation to Councillor Gerard McEwen who had stood down from the Committee after a period of long and valuable service. Members would be advised once information was received from Essex County Council as to a replacement for Councillor McEwen.

#### **3. Note of previous meeting**

The Group confirmed the notes for the meeting held on 13 February. These notes were received by STACC at its meeting on 24 April.

#### **4. Matters arising**

There were no separate matters arising. All issues were being discussed elsewhere on the agenda.

## **5. Airspace Issues**

### **(a) Additional waypoints on CLN 22 and DOV 04**

The Group noted that the trial – which was planned to last for a year – had begun on 7 May. In addition to easyJet, action was in hand to persuade Ryanair to participate. However their involvement was dependent upon approval from the Irish aeronautical authorities and it was hoped that this would be forthcoming shortly.

### **(b) Night Time joining point on 04 operations**

It was noted that this trial which resulted in a change in the night time joining point and help to reduce noise disturbance from aircraft arriving at night from the west was ongoing.

## **6. Sustainability Report**

STAL had now published their 2012 Report and this had been placed on the airport's website. The Group welcomed the earlier publication date – previous reports had tended not to be published until the summer. The Group were appreciative of the ongoing liaison with STAL that enabled their views to be considered. For example the Chairman and Secretary had had the opportunity to meet the external auditors and offer suggestions. STAL advised that MAG – the new owners – were committed to the existing 2013 targets but may wish to add to these at a future date.

In discussion, a number of points were raised. These included:-

- The report was concise, well presented and laid out. It was considered an improvement on previous reports. However the new presentation seemed to have resulted in the loss of the supporting data that led to the conclusions in the report. The report would also benefit through references as to how it linked in with the airport's overall sustainability strategies e.g. climate change. Future reports might put include greater information as to the context of the report and the airport's long term strategies.

- The report would benefit from more information on benchmarking being provided; in particular targets should be benchmarked not just with other airports but other comparable facilities e.g. shopping malls. There should now be scope for benchmarking at least in terms of other MAG airports. STAL advised that the scope for benchmarking depended on the reporting processes adopted by other airports particularly in Europe. However STAL commented that there was some further benchmarking information available in the auditors' report. STAL would be happy to share this with EIG. It was agreed that the issue of benchmarking should be discussed again at the next EIG meeting.
- The report did not appear to contain any detail about air quality targets
- Initial consideration was being given to greater use of electric vehicles.
- Car parking especially the express set down remained an issue. It was noted that STAL were planning to present a six month review report to the June UEG meeting. It was agreed that this review might usefully be circulated to EIG members.
- STAL were considering the most appropriate options to replace the previous BAA Community Trust Fund system.

It was agreed that STAL should provide an update at the next meeting. This could include further information about the integration of MAG's sustainability strategy, future STAL/EIG liaison arrangements and benchmarking

## **7. Sustainable Aviation Noise Map**

The Group noted that Sustainable Aviation (SA) had recently launched its Noise Road Map. The main conclusion was that noise from UK aviation would not increase despite a near doubling in flights over the next 40 years. It was maintained that this would be achieved through the development and introduction of quieter aircraft alongside the implementation of better operating procedures and improved land-use planning. STAL advised that many of the procedures and actions recommended by SA were already in operation at Stansted. The Group noted that significant noise reductions would not be achieved through engine design at Stansted, but would be achieved through procedural changes. It was agreed to keep the matter under review.

## **8. Vision Zero Campaign**

The Group received a presentation from Cathy Ricketts about STAL's Vision Zero campaign to improve the general health and wellbeing of the airport's operations. The aim of the campaign was to achieve zero harm across the airport by 2017 - zero fatalities, zero permanently disabling injuries, zero injuries to members of the public, zero long term harm to health.

This involved not only the airport but all its partners, subsidiaries or sub-contractors working within the airport. The campaign sought to adopt a pro active approach as well as changing cultures. Systems and processes were being reviewed and reassessed on H & S terms. A safety coaching scheme had been established as well as a staff reward system. The airport were working with Harlow College in developing posters and related material in support of the

campaign. The campaign also covered occupational health issues including mental health. The campaign would be monitored to gauge its impact on incidents and fatalities. Early indications were that it was having a positive impact. STAL were also receiving interest in the campaign from other business interests and organisations.

## **9. Consultations**

The Group noted that there were a number of Government consultations either already underway or soon to be launched. These included the Davies Commission on airport capacity, a DfT consultation on the proposed revision of the current guidance to the CAA on environmental objectives in exercising their air navigation functions, NATS were understood to be planning local consultation workshops on the LAMP project and the DfT were expected to issue the second stage of the night noise consultation in the Autumn. The Secretary would keep these under review and update the Group on relevant developments.

## **10. Matters Arising and Messages for STACC**

There were no immediate issues that should be brought to STACC's attention.

## **11. Date of Next Meeting**

14 August 2013

## AGENDA ITEM 7

### USER EXPERIENCE GROUP

#### MEETING OF THE USER EXPERIENCE GROUP OF THE STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, HELD AT THE AIRPORT ON 12 JUNE 2013

##### Membership

*	Rufus Barnes (representing surface transport interests) - Chairman
*	Keith Brown (representing tourism interests)
	Gary Jones (representing local authorities)
*	Peter Lainson (representing PRM interests)
	David Leigh (representing cargo interests)
*	Peter Odrich (representing business passengers)
	Julian Swift (representing local authorities)
	Olivia Vandyk (representing non business passengers)
	David Burch (representing commerce and business interests)
	Stewart Ashurst (Chairman of STACC)

(\* present at meeting)

##### Also present

Anita Harrison STAL

Alison Lilly STAL

Bill Form UKBA

Frank Evans Secretary and Technical Adviser to STACC

The meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m.

#### **1. Membership and apologies for absence**

The Chairman welcomed Keith Brown (Chief Executive Officer Visit East Anglia) and David Burch (Essex Chambers of Commerce) as new members of the Group. Mr Brown was replacing Peter Cansick who had retired after a number of years of valuable service. Mr Burch was unfortunately unable to attend. Apologies had also been received from Councillor Jones, Councillor Swift, Olivia Vandyk and Stewart Ashurst.

The Chairman also expressed its appreciation for Bill Form's (UKBA) active participation in recent UEG meetings. The Group had benefitted from the open and constructive engagement. Similar engagement with the airport had produced clear benefits in helping resolve problems. The Chairman wished Mr Form well in his retirement at the end of August.

## **2. Minutes of previous meeting**

The Group confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2013. (Copy attached). The minutes had been submitted to the STACC meeting on 24 April.

## **3. Matters arising**

The STAL representatives advised that due to a number of recent staff changes, it would not be possible to provide updates on all agenda items.

### **Work Programme: Express Set Down**

The Group had been expecting STAL to present a six month review of the arrangements as well as updates on the proposed new fencing arrangements and adequate access for wheelchairs. Recent staffing changes had delayed this work.

### **Provision of special assistance**

During the previous visit, the help button in the disabled toilet in the bus station had been found to be defective. STAL had since advised that the fault had been rectified and the help button was now working satisfactorily.

### **Special assistance**

An update on the provision of additional assistance desks in the IDL and the waiting room in the bus station was not available. It was agreed that STAL would provide the Secretary with an update that could be circulated to Members.

### **PRM survey**

The Group reminded STAL that it had offered to provide its PRM adviser to assist the airport with its proposed PRM survey

### **Signage**

Consultants had been engaged to conduct a signage survey. Members reminded STAL that the Group had previously raised a number of issues relating to signage. In particular these related to location and accessibility. In developing its signage strategy, it was important that key agencies such as the RNIB and MENCAP should be consulted. This would ensure that any new signage would be fully inclusive. Again the Group offered to help by providing input to the survey.

## **4. UK Borders Force**

Mr Form advised that whilst a recruitment campaign to fill his post was in progress, no replacement had yet been identified.

New rostering arrangements had been introduced from 1 April. However a number of posts remained to be filled. It was expected that staffing levels would increase and there was the option of mobile deployment. In terms of achieving performance targets, there were issues when a large number of flights arrived together, this resulted in congestion in the arrivals hall. A key consideration was how to measure performance. Should waiting times for passengers be measured once they arrived in the hall or in the corridors leading to the hall? Work was in hand to determine the best measurement. It was noted that waiting times were subject to public perception issues.

There had been some technology issues with the E readers but work was in hand to facilitate greater use.

## **5. Common Travel Area (CTA)**

The new CTA arrangements involving new infrastructure (lifts and stairs) were due to be introduced on 24 June. This would ensure the necessary segregation between passengers arriving from the CTA and elsewhere. It was suggested that the Group might visit the facility on its next airside visit.

## **6. Automatic Tickets**

STAL advised that new Automatic Ticket Presentation facilities had now been introduced. It was suggested that this might be an area that could be included in a future airside visit.

## **7. Terminal Refurbishment**

STAL outlined their emerging plans for refurbishment of the terminal. This involved a major reduction in the landside area which would enable the central search area to be doubled and the airside retail area to be increased. Members suggested that in line with previous practice it would be helpful if UEG could be actively engaged with the project as work progressed. In developing the project, members suggested that there were a number of key considerations. There should be no degradation in the customer experience; in particular passengers should not have to undertake additional walking time. This was important not only for the PRM passenger but the elderly and obese. Redesign of the check in area should ensure that there were no pinch points and conflicts of passenger movements. It was noted that unlike some other major airports, retail facilities to date had not been a key consideration for passengers using Stansted.

## **8. Airport Report**

STAL presented the attached report. Having reviewed ASQ and QSM performance, 5 measures had now been linked into the Airport overall KPIs. These were ASQ Overall Satisfaction; QSM Overall Satisfaction (departures journey); QSM IDL Seat Availability; QSM Departures Toilet Cleanliness and QSM Security Staff Helpfulness. In discussion, members stressed the need for comparable bench marking to assess how the airport was performing against other

airports. It would also be helpful to monitor ASQ and QSM performance during the terminal refurbishment project to assess the effect on service performance.

## **9. Any Other Business**

Peter Odrich provided the Group with a helpful insight relating to his recent visit to Miami Airport. A key issue for the airport was the mobility of passengers especially as Miami attracted a high proportion of elderly passengers. This meant that more passengers required assistance. As a result, additional time had to be factored in to ensure that passengers reached the gate on time. The airport also handled a high proportion of obese passengers who needed assistance to and from the gate. All this meant that more and more passengers were requiring assistance which was starting to place increasing demand on the airport's resources. This trend was likely to be seen at European airports in the future and this challenge would need to be addressed.

## **11 Date of Next Meeting**

11 September

Members would be further advised as to the pre meeting tour but it was noted that the PRM visit Needed to be completed.

## **AGENDA ITEM 7**

### **CORPORATE AFFAIRS GROUP**

### **MEETING OF THE CORPORATE AFFAIRS GROUP OF THE STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, HELD AT ENTERPRISE HOUSE ON 29 MAY 2013**

#### **Membership**

Stewart Ashurst (Chairman)

Keith Artus

Rufus Barnes

Brian Ross

#### **Advisers**

Steve Bailes

Zhanine Oates

#### **Secretary and Technical Adviser to STACC**

Frank Evans

#### **MAG**

Chris Wiggan

The meeting commenced at 11.00 a.m.

#### **1. Introduction**

At the STACC meeting on 24 April, it had been agreed that CAG should meet to consider the preparation of a draft submission to the Airports Commission. The meeting had been made open to all STACC members. MAG had also been invited to attend to advise the Group of their growth plans for the airport. Copies of MAG's recent response to the Commission had also been circulated to Members.

#### **2. MAG Growth Plans**

MAG explained that work relating to the Davies Commission was now being led by Tim Hawkins within a new Corporate Affairs Group where responsibilities included communications, regulation and sustainability. MAG had made a submission to the Commission which dealt with the best use of existing capacity in the short and medium term. MAG's overall view was that there was spare capacity across its four airports (Manchester, East Midlands, Bournemouth and Stansted) which could be utilised to help ease UK airport capacity constraints. A further submission about the longer term was currently in preparation and would be completed by July. In terms of Stansted, MAG considered that there was spare capacity at peak times. The existing planning permissions allowed passenger numbers to increase to 35 mppa. MAG considered that with additional infrastructure, a single runway operation could handle between 40 -45 mppa. The airport would be able to provide feeder services both within the UK and Europe. MAG further considered that a number of policy levers (e.g. the reform of APD and changes in economic and competition regulation) as well as improved surface access could be deployed to ensure better use of capacity.

#### **3. Discussion**

It was noted that STACC had agreed that the main focus of the submission should be the key issue of UK airport capacity -- especially the future needs of London and the South East. In discussion, it was further considered that any STACC submission response should be short and focussed.

a. The Group was reminded of the recent SSE paper on demand forecasting to the Commission which argued that there was no capacity crisis. In 2012, UK airports handled around 2m passenger air transport movements - a minimal increase (0.28%) over 2001 whereas passenger throughput

over the same period had increased by 22%. This meant that a significant increase in passenger numbers had been accommodated without a corresponding major increase in aircraft movements. This suggested that the issue of future airport capacity should be addressed in demand terms of aircraft movements rather than passenger numbers.

b. MAG's view that - in the short and medium term- significant growth could be achieved on a single runway operation was welcomed. However it was noted that MAG's long term views would not be available until July.

c. The Group also welcomed MAG's proposals to seek a wider diversification of services especially to medium and long haul destinations. The current lack of a comprehensive network of services meant that residents in the Stansted area wishing to travel to these destinations had to use airports both in the UK and Europe other than their local airport.

d. In terms of developing an interlining network, it was suggested that there were a number of issues that would need to be addressed. These included:-

- Through ticketing – most major scheduled airlines operating to the UK tended to be part of airline alliances. This facilitated ticket issue and use. It was understood that the major low cost airlines at Stansted were not currently part of any airline alliance.
- Luggage allowance – low cost airlines had strict baggage allowance limits whereas scheduled airlines adopted a more flexible policy. Long haul passenger interlining over Stansted would expect a similar flexible policy when joining a feeder service operated by a low cost carrier and would not expect to pay a surcharge.

- Airport lounges and associated facilities – Premium passengers expected a number of facilities which were not currently available at Stansted. The development of these facilities would require significant investment by the airlines. Before committing to such investment, airlines would need to be satisfied that traffic levels would be sufficient to justify the outlay.

e. The Group welcomed MAG's call for improved surface access. This was important not only for passengers using the airport but also for residents living in the Stansted area. Good transport links would be key in any proposed growth of the airport with the consequential need to widen its employment base. It was noted that significant investment would be required to upgrade the line in particular for the provision of additional track to help relieve pressure on key pinch points for example at Tottenham Hale and Cheshunt.

f. The Group considered that the use of policy levers should be explored. In particular, there would seem to be some value in considering differential rates of APD as a means of attracting new airlines to Stansted.

g. In terms of environmental impact, it was noted that the greater number of airlines currently operating at Stansted used modern noise efficient aircraft. There would be local concern if any new airline operated older noisier aircraft and so adversely affected the current noise climate. It was noted that the Government was about to commence work on reviewing departure noise limits which might provide a means of controlling such impacts. It was noted that in the MAG submission, the peak times table assessing available capacity included the 0500-0600 slot. This period fell within the night period and was covered by the current night noise restrictions. Utilising this slot would run counter to a policy of reducing night flights.

#### **4. Next steps**

It was agreed that the Secretary would prepare a draft submission for consideration by members of the Group. Given the closing date for submissions to the Commission was 19 July, it would be necessary to agree a final draft by email.

**Stansted Airport Consultative Committee  
June 2013**

## **AGENDA ITEM 8**

### **STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

#### **FINANCIAL MATTERS AND COMMITTEE ARRANGEMENTS**

During the past year or so, we have touched generally on matters to do with finance, with administration and with committee arrangements. This report updates and continues our discussion on some financial matters and some committee arrangements.

#### **General Funding**

As far as all Consultative Committees nationally are concerned, it is understood that the issue of Committee funding will be addressed in the proposed general revision of the DfT Guidelines for Consultative Committees. A draft of this revision is expected in the late summer or early autumn with a view to the final form of the revised Guidelines being published by the end of the year. Meanwhile, as regards the general funding arrangements for STACC itself, the airport Managing Director and I will be discussing the issue later in the summer. This discussion will include how best to realise - in local STACC terms - the balance between the statutory independence of such committees and the reality of their funding.

#### **STACC General Activities Fund**

Another set of financial issues concerns the allocation of STACC's existing budget. Amongst other decisions, we agreed last summer that the element of the budget which constituted the accumulated General Activities Fund (GAF) should, after meeting each year the cost of the honoraria to the two Working Group Chairmen, be *"divided equally between and thereafter used at the discretion of a) the UEG, b) the EIG and c) STACC itself on the understanding that any such use of the funds must also be approved by the Chairman of the Committee"*. At present, the GAF total is £26,727 and we are planning to use the Fund to benefit our work as a Committee.

Our UEG has worked hard over the past two years to monitor in particular the quality of the passenger experience through the airport and to make recommendations to the operator for sustained improvements. Judgements as to performance quality are critical and being well informed about Stansted's performance relative to other similar airports is an obviously important factor in making such judgements. Whilst UEG receives regular statistical information, this of itself is not always as comprehensive as the UEG would wish. A key area is benchmarking with the UEG wishing to measure and consider the airport's performance against other comparable airports. Visits to comparable airports and actual focused discussions there with peer management and consultative committee representatives would be extremely useful. The UEG Chairman and I believe that a visit annually to a different but appropriate airport preferably focusing on one or two particular topics would be extremely useful

and an entirely suitable call upon the GAF. A study visit to another comparable airport will be arranged therefore for members of the UEG, the details of which will be settled by the UEG with the cost of the visit being met from the GAF.

Similarly, much hard work has been undertaken by our EIG. Within the last year, STAL and now the new airport management team (AMT) have agreed the good sense of involving EIG 'upstream' in the general audit work commissioned by the operator in respect of the annual Sustainability Report. This has been much welcomed and is beginning to work to good effect. However, from time to time, it would also be helpful to EIG's deliberations if some outside, objective and specialised opinion about an area of the operator's responsibilities could be received. This would be separate from the mainstream audit work referred to above and would be more finely attuned periodically to one or more of the issues on which the EIG has decided to focus. The EIG Chairman and I believe it would be helpful to commission a small piece of independent consultancy work to this end, the precise terms of which would be settled by the EIG and the cost of which would be met from the GAF. Equally – and similar to the UEG proposal above - a study visit to another comparable airport in connection with a particular EIG issue would be very instructive. The details of such a visit will be settled by the EIG with the cost of the visit again being met from the GAF.

### **Committee Arrangements**

We have thought that one of our four main STACC meetings might be held more within the local community than at Enterprise House and might include in part a 'Question Time' format. The Committee and the AMT could then be questioned directly by members of the general local community. (This would be additional to the formal Public Question Time which we hold at the start of each of our regular meetings). However, MAG has a track record elsewhere of being clearly proactive rather than reactive in terms of its relationship with local communities. The AMT themselves intend to engage directly with the various elements of the local community on a regular basis. Consequently and on balance, the AMT would prefer to pursue their own tried and tested method of communicating locally rather than being part of the STACC meeting format and location which we have been considering at present.

Nevertheless, I do believe it is entirely right that one of our four meetings each year should take the form of an 'Annual General Meeting' - at least in part. At such a meeting, we would deal with certain constitutional and administrative issues such as the appointment of Committee members (including Committee and Working Group Chairmen), terms of office, appointments to Working Groups, Working Group work programmes, appointments of STACC representatives on other bodies, advisers, annual budget matters and any adjustments to our general constitutional and administrative arrangements. Such matters would be dealt with more formally than now, would be transparent and (which is very important) would be seen to be as such by the public.

On constitutional matters in particular, we have thought it sensible to reflect on these in the light of the proposed general DfT Guidelines for Consultative Committees. In

fact it would probably also make good sense to hold one of our Awaydays when the Guidelines are published at the end of the year. We might also then consider our Committee arrangements generally in readiness for an AGM to be held say in the early Spring and at the start of the new financial year too.

The views and advice of the Committee are invited.

Stewart Ashurst  
Chairman of STACC  
July 2013

## **AGENDA ITEM 9**

# **STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

## **RESPONSE TO THE AIRPORTS COMMISSION JULY 2013**

Stansted Airport Consultative Committee welcomes the opportunity to submit some initial views on the future of UK airport capacity.

### **Introduction**

The Committee notes that the Government's Aviation Policy Framework states that there is strong evidence that aviation brings direct and indirect economic benefits to the UK. The Committee would wish aviation to continue to make a significant contribution to the future prosperity of the UK and for it to make such a contribution to airports' local economies. The Committee would also support the further objective set out in the policy framework that the UK's air links continue to make it one of the best connected countries in the world providing access to both international and regional services. However it is vitally important - especially for communities living around airports - that the future development of the industry should not at the same time adversely impact upon the local community in environmental terms.

### **Future demand**

The Committee notes that long term forecasts developed by the Department of Transport predict that South East airports are expected to be at 100% capacity around 2030 and that these forecasts are the prime driver behind the decision to establish the Airports Commission. However the Committee notes that these forecasts are based on passenger numbers. If the capacity issue is considered on an aircraft movements basis, a different scenario emerges. In 2012, UK airports handled around 2m passenger air transport movements - a minimal increase (0.28%) over 2001 whereas passenger throughput over the same period had increased by 22%. This means that a significant increase in passenger numbers has been accommodated without a corresponding major increase in aircraft movements. The planned entry into service of new aircraft with increased passenger capacity suggests that this trend will continue. It is therefore important that the issue of future airport capacity is addressed as much in demand terms of aircraft movements as in passenger numbers. The Committee invites the Commission to consider future demand accordingly.

### **Future demand at Stansted**

The Committee notes recent statements by MAG that - in the short and medium term - significant growth can be achieved at Stansted on the basis of a single runway operation. This is against the background that the airport is currently operating at half its permitted capacity. The existing planning permissions allow passenger numbers to increase to 35 mppa. MAG has stated that with additional infrastructure, a single runway operation could handle between 40 -45 mppa. There is also scope to utilise the current spare capacity at peak times. Given this available capacity, there would not seem to be any need for runway expansion at Stansted. The Committee notes that MAG will not produce their long term views until July and would wish to reserve the right to comment further at a later stage.

### **Development of new services**

MAG proposes to seek a wider diversification of services especially to medium and long haul destinations. The current lack of a comprehensive network of services means that residents in the Stansted area wishing to travel to these destinations have to use airports both in the UK and mainland Europe rather than their local airport. The Committee welcomes MAG's proposals regarding diversification provided it does not result in a worsening noise climate at the airport.

### **Better connectivity**

The Committee also welcomes the possibilities and benefits that may arise from the development of an interlining network. However the Committee believes that successful implementation depends on a number of key factors. Low cost airlines operate to a different business model from that operated by scheduled airlines at Heathrow. This results in different business practices and services. For example

- through ticketing – most major scheduled airlines operating to the UK tend to be part of airline alliances. This facilitates ticket issue and use. It is the Committee's understanding that none of the major low cost airlines at Stansted currently belong to any airline alliance.
- Luggage allowance – low cost airlines operate strict baggage allowance limits whereas scheduled airlines adopt a more flexible policy. Long haul passenger interlining over Stansted would expect a similar flexible policy when joining a feeder service operated by a low cost carrier and would not expect to pay a surcharge.
- Airport lounges and associated facilities – Premium passengers expect a number of facilities which are not currently available at Stansted. The development of these facilities would require significant investment by the airlines. Before committing to such investment, airlines would need to be satisfied that traffic levels would be sufficient to justify the outlay.

The Committee is not in a position to comment on either the likely rate of passenger growth at Stansted or the likelihood of a wider range of services being provided.

### **Surface access**

The Committee considers that any future development of the airport must be supported by improved surface access. This is important not only for passengers using the airport but also for local commuters. The Committee is mindful that significant investment will be required to upgrade the railway line, in particular, for the provision of additional track to help relieve pressure on pinch points along with the removal of some of the many level crossings along the route. These improvements will require the active participation and support of the DfT and Network Rail and will need co ordination with proposals to hand responsibility for part of the route to the Mayor of London. It is however essential that the needs of all users of the West Anglia lines should be taken into account.

The adequacy of the road network serving Stansted Airport also needs to be addressed, in particular the M11 from J8 to J9, the A120 link from the A10 to the A12 and the airport access and egress arrangements at J8 of the M11. 4

### **Taxation**

The Committee believes that the Commission should explore the option of using policy levers as means to help address capacity issues. In particular, it has been suggested that there would be value in considering differential rates of APD as a means of easing the pressure on Heathrow and making better use of airports which had significant spare capacity. The Committee would wish to see this suggestion investigated.

### **Environmental impact**

In terms of environmental impact, the Committee notes that the majority of airlines currently operating at Stansted use modern, noise efficient aircraft. There would be considerable local concern should any new airline introduce services using older, noisier aircraft thereby adversely affecting the current noise climate. There is also concern that the larger aircraft likely to be introduced on long haul routes would be noisier than the smaller aircraft presently using the airport. The Committee is aware that the Government has commenced work on reviewing departure noise limits which might provide a means of controlling such impacts.

There would also be similar concern should any option result in an increase in night flights. The Committee notes that the recent Government consultation on a new night flights regime for the three London Airports stated that the key concern for residents living under or close to night flight paths continued to be whether an appropriate balance had indeed been struck between economic benefits and adverse environmental impacts. Indeed, the latter impacts are further recognized in the Executive Summary where it is stated:-

*“Despite the significant improvements in aircraft technology and the associated noise reduction benefits, noise from aircraft operations at night remains widely regarded as the least acceptable aspect of aviation noise and the government has long recognised this”.*

Given this, the Committee believes that any resolution to the South East airport capacity issue which envisaged an increase in night flights would run counter to stated Government policy statements.

## **Stansted Airport Consultative Committee**

**July 2013**

## **AGENDA ITEM 9**

### **MAG Press release**

#### **Capacity for Growth –Stansted’s potential to meet air capacity needs**

19 July 2013

New owners M.A.G have today set out London Stansted’s potential to meet air capacity demand in London and the South East in the short, medium and long-term, and presented a range of options which it believes should be on the Airports Commission’s shortlist for further study in 2014 and 2015.

M.A.G’s submission, ‘Capacity for Growth’, responds to a call for evidence from the Airports Commission which is examining options for meeting the need for additional airport capacity in the South East.

Charlie Cornish, Chief Executive of M.A.G, said:

“Our short-term priority is to make Stansted better for passengers than ever before, and we’ve made major progress in our first four months of ownership, including starting work on an £80 million terminal transformation.

“Stansted is uniquely placed to meet the UK’s aviation capacity needs now and over the next 15 years. Almost overnight, Stansted could double the number of flights it handles without any need for significant investment in new infrastructure.

“Looking to the long-term, the interests of passengers will be best served by a pragmatic approach, focused on delivering new capacity that is cost-effective and flexible, and capable of driving competition across the aviation industry.

“Developing new capacity at a number of airports is likely to be best for passengers. Should the Commission take a different view and conclude that the UK needs an effective hub to provide international connectivity, then Stansted could certainly fulfil that role in a cost-effective way.”

“Both options should be considered, but whichever path the Commission takes the costs and the environmental impacts of building new capacity at Stansted are likely to be far lower than at alternative locations. From the short term to the long term, Stansted ticks every box.”

The options for Stansted set out in M.A.G’s submission to the Airports Commission include:

- Options for an additional runway, either to the north-west of the existing runway (with capacity of between 70 – 80 million passengers a year) or to the east of the existing runway (with capacity up to around 90 million passengers a year).
- An airport with four runways (with capacity of between 140 to 160 million passengers a year) designed and operated as an effective hub airport with good resilience and easy connections for passengers between flights.

The Airports Commission has identified the criteria it will use to evaluate the options for expansion. Stansted is well placed against each of these criteria as a viable, cost competitive expansion option, with lower environmental and social costs than the alternatives. Of particular note is the fact that even with new runway capacity, Stansted’s noise impacts will be a small fraction of those experienced around Heathrow.

Capacity development at Stansted would support London’s development to the east and along the London-Stansted-Cambridge corridor, and act as a catalyst for growth and productivity in a region that will be critical to driving economic growth in the UK in the future.

Key benefits of further expansion at Stansted include:

- Stansted is a scaleable and flexible solution to the UK's aviation capacity needs – able to offer additional capacity and then grow incrementally to two, three or four runways in the future.
- Fewer residents are exposed to noise at Stansted than at other major airports in the South East; 258,500 at Heathrow compared to 1,250 at Stansted.
- The space for additional runways, terminals, roads and rail connections is more readily available at Stansted than at alternatives.
- Stansted is likely to represent the most cost-effective solution for the country. It is estimated an on-airport cost of developing a four-runway hub at Stansted would around £10bn – much less than the cost of an Estuary Airport or expansion at Heathrow.

- Ends -

[M.A.G Airports Commission Submissions](#)

## **AGENDA ITEM 12**

### **Stansted Airport Consultative Committee**

#### **Government consultations**

Note by the Secretary

The Committee is invited to note the following:-

#### **Air Navigation Guidance for the Civil Aviation Authority**

The Department of Transport is consulting on the draft of the revised 'Guidance to the Civil Aviation Authority on environmental objectives relating to the exercise of its air navigation functions'. The Consultation focuses on those issues which have been deemed to be the most significant and includes a number of questions. The consultation closes on 17 September 2013.

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/208222/consultation-document.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/208222/consultation-document.pdf)

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/207856/air-navigation-guidance-draft.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/207856/air-navigation-guidance-draft.pdf)

It is suggested that EIG take the lead in considering whether the Committee should respond to the consultation and if necessary preparing a draft STACC response. Given that STACC will not meet again until the end of October, it may be necessary to agree a response by e-mail.

#### **Davies Commission**

As mentioned under Agenda item 9 above, the Commission has issued a discussion paper on noise [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/223764/airports-commission-noise.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/223764/airports-commission-noise.pdf)

#### **Night Noise Consultation**

It is understood that the Department for Transport will be publishing the second stage of its consultation on the next night noise regime at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted Airports during the autumn. No further details about timing are known at this stage.

#### **London Airspace Management Plan (LAMP)**

NATS is currently designing an extensive programme to modernise UK airspace. The major part of this - LAMP - involves airspace in the South East. Before undertaking any detailed design work, NATS wish to engage with key stakeholders. This contrasts with NATS's previous major consultation – Terminal Control North- when there was no pre consultation. Members will be advised once timing details are finalised.

## **Economic Regulation**

The CAA has published non-confidential responses to its initial proposals for the economic regulation of Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted airports from 1 April 2014 (Q6). The response on Stansted can be found on the CAA's website:

<http://www.caa.co.uk/default.aspx?catid=78&pagetype=90&pageid=14930>

Further information on the Q6 price control reviews is also on the CAA website at:

<http://www.caa.co.uk/default.aspx?catid=78&pagetype=90&pageid>

## **Civil Aviation Act 2012 - information powers**

The 2012 Civil Aviation Act provides the CAA with new duties to ensure information is published that helps consumers compare the offerings of different companies (airlines and airports as appropriate) and that sets out aviation's environmental impact (primarily noise and emissions). The duties are backed with new powers that allow the CAA to request currently unavailable information from businesses if the benefits of doing this outweigh the adverse effects (cost).

The CAA are currently consulting on a draft Statement of Policy on how it proposes to implement these duties. They are also holding a number of workshops with key stakeholders. Initial indications are that there is already a lot of information available to passengers about aviation industry, but it less frequently standardised, comparable, up-to-date and available at a timely point in the booking process. Similarly, environmental information is often piecemeal, and differs significantly in terms of its coverage, presentation and nature. The legislation includes a specific power for the CAA to stipulate the form and manner of publication. They conclude that for information to be useful, it must be available, accessible and applicable, allowing people to act on it. The consultation on the Statement of Policy closes on 31 August 2013 and the CAA hope to publish the Statement during the autumn and begin to publish information thereafter.

## AGENDA ITEM 13

### SUMMARY NOTE OF MEETING

#### 37<sup>th</sup> ANNUAL LIAISON MEETING BETWEEN AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES HELD AT EDINBURGH AIRPORT ON WEDNESDAY 5 JUNE AND THURSDAY 6 JUNE 2013

The 2013 Annual Meeting was held on 5 and 6 June with 20 Airport Consultative Committees (ACCs) being represented. The comprehensive agenda covered a wide range of current and future aviation issues. The UKACCs Secretariat will be preparing a detailed note of the meeting in due course. In summary, the following main points were made:

#### EDINBURGH

In welcoming ACC delegates, Edinburgh Airport gave a presentation about developments at the airport. The last year had seen a change in ownership. The airport was now owned by GIP. It was understood that GIP operated to a business model which would see the airport developed and then sold after a ten year period.

The past year had seen a number of developments. The new owners wished to exploit Edinburgh's position as the gateway to Scotland and develop new routes. A Route Development Fund (£15m) had been established. The initial main focus was on attracting airlines from the Middle East and North America (the US and Canada). There was longer term interest in long haul destinations including the Far East. However runway limitations would probably mean that such routes could only be operated with payload restrictions.

The change in ownership in addition to new branding and image had stimulated new attitudes among staff evidenced by much positive feedback from passengers. However the biggest success had been the introduction of free Wi-Fi – responding to a long standing request from passengers especially the business sector.

#### AIRPORTS COMMISSION

Phil Graham (the Airports Commission secretary) gave a presentation outlining the work that had been conducted so far and its future work programme. Having reviewed the submissions received on options, they planned to consult on a number of specific options in the autumn. Prior to that, the Commission planned to issue a discussion paper on noise before the summer recess. The Commission were at pains to stress that no option had yet been ruled in or out at this stage.

A discussion paper on **airport operational models** had been published in which views were sought on the choice of a single major national hub or a number of smaller hubs. ACCs were asked to both ACCs were encouraged to make individual submissions on this discussion paper and also consider whether there was support for a particular option. If a common view were agreed, UKACCs could make a collective submission to the Commission

In discussion, it was noted that **connectivity** was a key factor in the development of a successful and prosperous aviation system in the UK. Regional airports needed to be supported by good transport links. Connectivity between regional airports and London (especially Heathrow) remained a key concern amongst delegates. This was a particular issue for airports in the far regions of the UK where

there was no viable alternative to air travel. The Flybe decision to axe all of its Gatwick flights, having sold its arrival and departure slots at the London airport to easyJet was a particular current concern. easyJet had yet to announce their detailed future plans for these regional services which provided flights from Gatwick to Belfast City, Guernsey, Inverness, the Isle of Man, Jersey, Newcastle and Newquay. Without a connection to the south east, passengers were likely to interline over major European hubs such as Schiphol, Frankfurt and Paris CDG to the detriment of UK aviation. In view of this, it was decided that UKACCs should prepare a response to emphasise the Group's concerns about the need to protect domestic slots for regional services based upon the comments previously submitted to the DfT

It was suggested that a system of **differential levels of APD** might provide an appropriate lever to attract airlines to airports outside the South East and utilise available capacity. However the Airport Commission response seemed to indicate as APD i.e. taxation was a HM Treasury responsibility, it was beyond their remit.

### **CAA INFORMATION POWERS**

The CAA (James Tallack, Senior Consumer Policy Adviser, Regulatory Policy Group,) explained the background to the Civil Aviation Act 2012 under which the collection and dissemination of information becomes a CAA regulatory function. The Act enables the CAA to require information to be made available on aspects of the aviation industry's performance, whether or not the CAA regulates them. Under the legislation, the CAA must publish, or arrange for others to publish the relevant information. In terms of consumers, the information should assist passengers and others users of air transport to compare services and facilities. The CAA may also publish guidance with a view to improving standards. On the environment, the information should relate to the environmental effects of civil aviation in the UK. The CAA may publish guidance with a view to mitigating adverse environmental effects. In both cases the CAA may specify the form and manner of publication.

The new information powers was generally welcomed by delegates - particularly if this resulted in a comparison table which provided passengers with information to review the facilities and services across a number of airports. However it was noted that airports already published information. The availability of such information needed to be initially reviewed before prescribing information under the Act. The provision of information needed to be proportionate and the process subject to cost benefit analysis. It was suggested that different criteria might need to apply for different airports. For example, comparison information would be helpful to the consumer where there were a number of competing airports e.g. in the South East. However at airports where there was no other competing airport, the information might be of limited value. At these "isolated" airports, the consumer would not have the luxury of choice – the main issue would be price and whether the relevant destination was served.

It was also suggested in terms of improving the passenger experience, it was important that the CAA should engage with other relevant government departments and agencies. For example immigration delays were often subject of passenger complaints. Information about the UKBA service delivery would seem to be a key issue.

The CAA were currently consulting on their Statement of Policy. Delegates were encouraged to respond to the CAA direct and to copy their response to the UKACCs Secretariat by no later than Friday 26 July. If there were common issues across the UKACCs membership then the Secretariat would prepare a response on behalf of UKACCs - a draft of which to be circulated to ACCs in the first week of August for endorsement.

## **REVIEW OF GUIDELINES FOR CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES**

The Department for Transport (Tamara Goodwin) advised that it was proposing to consult and issue updated guidance by the end of the year. Although that the need for updating the guidance has regularly been raised with the Department, the impetus for the current action seemed to stem from the responses to the Aviation Policy Framework (APF) consultation. The APF had suggested that ACCs could play an effective role in local community engagement. Delegates sought further clarification as to whether there were any examples as to where it was perceived that ACCs were ineffective. However the DfT declined to provide any further clarification. The current timetable saw the new guidance being issued by the end of the year. This would be informed by a limited consultation in the autumn. The general feeling amongst delegates was that this timetable was extremely tight.

In discussion, a number of issues were raised with the Department:-

### **Funding**

It was important that committees should be seen to be independent. The current finance arrangements especially where the airport provided all the funding had given rise to adverse comments from some quarters that committees were not independent. In discussion it emerged that committees were funded in a variety of ways. In some cases, the airport provided all the financing. In others, local authorities helped to meet the cost of committees. In some cases the funding was controlled and authorised by the airport; in others the committees were voted funds and responsible for the administration and authorisation of expenditure. Appropriate funding arrangements were necessary if it were to operate independently. For example it was suggested to the Department that the revenue generated from the new airport licensing system could be used to help fund ACCs

### **Appointment of chairman**

It was important that the Chairman of an ACC should be seen to be independent with the recruitment process organised accordingly. However it was noted that in cases where a Chairman was considered not to be acting in an appropriate manner, Committees did have the option to remove the Chairman

### **Size and composition of committees**

Given that each airport had different local circumstances, the size of committees varied across ACCs, The number of representatives from local authorities also varied. Some ACCs had one member others had up to three.

### **Dispute**

It was noted that apart to a direct approach to Ministers, there were no current arrangements for resolving disputes. It was felt that the CAA did not have the resource to act as arbiter for the 51 designated ACCs

### **CAA CONSUMER PANEL**

Keith Richards (Chair, CAA Consumer Panel) updated delegates on the work of the Panel over the past year. The Panel was now fully operational. Members of the Panel had all been appointed and

four meetings held. The Panel's first annual report was currently in preparation. It was noted that the Panel had no executive powers but had more of an influencing role.

The Panel wished to have an active programme of engagement with key stakeholders including ACCs. The challenge was to consider how best to do this - perhaps stakeholders might attend meetings when key issues of interest were being discussed. In terms of ongoing engagement, it was stressed that the Panel would benefit from using UKACCs as a reference group. The Chair of the Panel would be invited to attend future Annual Meetings to provide an update on its work and to share experiences and issues of concern.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

Sustainable Aviation (SA) (Dr Andy Jefferson) gave a presentation on the recently issued **SA noise road map**. SA suggested that whilst there would be a growth in aircraft movements, there would not be a commensurate increase in noise. Mitigation action e.g. quieter aircraft and operational procedures would be used to reduce noise impacts. The Government's aim to help ensure that the benefits of future growth were shared with the industry working with local communities to tackle noise and other environmental issues was noted. Delegates highlighted the need to assure people that they would benefit from technological and operational improvements to reduce noise. If noise solutions could be seen to benefit all sectors, this could be instrumental in helping manage environmental impacts around airports. It was also noted that noise levels from road and rail often exceed aircraft noise levels, yet aviation seemed to attract a disproportionate amount of criticism and attention.

On **planning**, delegates were disappointed that PPG 24 had not been replaced or revised. The localism policy meant that there was no detailed guidance available for local planning authorities. This was despite the Taylor Group - commissioned by DCLG - recommending that detailed guidance should be developed. In terms of aircraft noise impacts, there was a need for some form of consistent guidance that could be used by all planning authorities dealing with airport noise issues. The lack of common guidance ran the danger of individual authorities developing their own policy which could lead to different airports operating to different criteria. It was agreed that UKACCs should write to the relevant government departments calling for common guidance. As responsibility for planning was a devolved issue, it was suggested that the Scottish ACCs might consider raising the issue with the Scottish government.

### **PRMs**

It was noted that a UK industry group comprising ABTA, CAA, DfT, the Equality and Human Rights Commission, airlines, airports, tour operators, travel agents, PRM service providers and an independent disability representative last year had issued new guidelines - *Pre-Notification Guidance - for Supporting Passengers with Reduced Mobility*. Pre-notification rates had improved but still remained an issue. At some airports fake PRMs was also a problem with some passengers feigning a disability to jump airport queues. There was also a need to ensure that across UK airports, there was a consistent approach on the availability of PRM related information – an issue that could be helped by the CAA's new information powers. It was also stressed that assistance at airports should encompass all forms of disability not just those passengers in a wheelchair.

## **EUROPEAN AVIATION UPDATE**

The DfT advised that the airports package was unlikely to receive priority under the Lithuanian Presidency. The main focus was likely to be the Single European Sky and passenger rights.

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Flight safety rules**

The issue of flight safety rules had been raised at the Manchester ACC. This related to proposals from the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) regarding harmonisation of the flight safety rules. The pilot representatives had registered concerns that the new proposals could result in pilots flying while fatigued. The proposals were currently before the European Parliament. Other ACCs were asked to consider whether this was an issue at their airports and there was a need to make representation.

## **VENUES FOR FUTURE CONFERENCES**

☐ Gatwick - 2014