

STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Secretariat

E-mail contact: fefamily@blueyonder.co.uk
website: www.stacc.info

STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: Wednesday 27 January 2016
Time 2.00pm
Venue Enterprise House, Stansted Airport
Meeting Room Dove/Carvair

Could any Member unable to attend the meeting please let the Secretary know, if possible by 4.30 pm, on Tuesday, 26 October. Members wishing to use the staff car park are asked to confirm car registration and contact details with Anna Perkins.

(e-mail Anna_Perkins@stanstedairport.com)

AGENDA

1. New Members, Apologies for Absence and Deputising Attenders

i. Membership

ii. Apologies

2. Public Question Time

i. Mr Jonathan Fox

“ MAG developed a second runway at Manchester 15 years ago and have as yet not needed to utilise this extra capacity as the airport only handles around 22 million passengers per year. Can you give us an assurance that MAG will not act with the same degree of prematurity at Stansted? “

ii. Sarah Cousins

“ "How many houses did STAL sell last year?"

3. Minutes

- i. To approve as a correct record the attached draft Minutes of the STACC Committee meeting held on 21 October 2015.

ii. **Matters Arising**

Any outstanding matters recorded in the Minutes of the previous meeting will be itemised and considered elsewhere on the agenda.

4. Working Groups : Reports of meetings

To receive the draft Minutes and Notes of the following Working Group meetings held since the October Committee meeting:

- i. Environmental Issues Group – 11 November 2015
- ii. User Experience Group – 9 December 2015.

5. Airport Managing Director's Report

The Airport Managing Director will present the attached quarterly report

6. Biennial Awayday

The Committee is invited to consider the attached paper from the Chairman

7. London-Stansted-Cambridge Consortium

Presentation by Dr Stephen King, Deputy Director of the London-Stansted-Cambridge Consortium on the LSCC Growth Commission

8. Date of Next Meeting

The Committee is invited to note that the next meeting will be held on 20 April

**Stansted Airport Consultative Committee
January 2016**

DRAFT

STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 21 OCTOBER 2015 AT ENTERPRISE HOUSE STANSTED AIRPORT

ATTENDANCE

Chairman – Stewart Ashurst*

Users of Airport

Freight interests (1) – David Leigh

Passenger airline companies (2) Peter Mantle *

Business passengers (1) - Peter Odrich*

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

Non Business passengers (1)

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) – Rodney Bass

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)

East Herts Association of Local Councils (1)

Stop Stansted Expansion (1) - Brian Ross

Commerce and Business interests (1) – David Burch*

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

Ms Zhanine Oates, Adviser Essex County Council*

Representing Stansted Airport Limited (STAL)

Mr A Harrison - Managing Director*

Mr C Wiggan - Head of Public Affairs and Sustainable Development*

Karen Smart - Operations Director

Mr N Robinson - CSR Director*

Department for Transport

Colin Dunn*

Secretariat

Frank Evans - Secretary and Technical Adviser to the Committee*

1. Apologies for Absence and Membership

a. Apologies had been received from Keith Brown, Danny Purton, David Leigh and Brian Ross (represented by Peter Sanders)

b. The Chairman proposed the following changes to membership:-

Non business/leisure representative - Julie Jones;

Hertford Association of Local and Parish Councils - Angela Alder. (It was noted that this association had now taken over the role of the East Hertfordshire Association of Local Councils. This change would need to be reflected in the Committee's constitution at next year's Annual Meeting)

Environmental Interests - Richard Burrett.

These changes were **ENDORSED AND APPROVED** by the Committee.

2. Public Question Time

No Public Questions had been received.

3. Minutes

a. The draft minutes of the STACC Annual Meeting held on 24 June 2015 were received and **ENDORSED** as a correct record.

b. There was one matter arising which was not covered elsewhere on the Agenda. It was noted that the third paragraph of Item 9 on page 5 of the draft minutes referred to the request that job descriptions should be prepared for the Chairman and the Secretary/Techni-

cal Adviser. It was noted that the request had related to draft job objectives rather than job descriptions. The Chairman undertook to prepare draft objectives.

4. Working Groups: Reports of meetings

The Committee received and **ENDORSED** the Minutes and Notes of the following Working Group meetings held since the June Committee meeting:

i. Environmental Issues Group – 29 July 2015

The Group had noted that information requested about the pay back period for environmental projects had not yet been provided

The Group had further considered the paper prepared by Dr Hooper (MMU) on alternative metrics and had asked for the paper to be supplemented. The revised paper had just been received and would be considered by the Group at its next meeting on 11 November

The Group had liaised closely with the AMT in respect of the current consultation on the RNP1 trial. Early indications from both the responses and roadshows were that there was support for making the trial permanent. It remained disappointed that despite concerted efforts Ryanair had yet to join the trial. It was understood that the delay seemed from the Irish authorities. Action would continue to try and ensure Ryanair to participate in the trial.

The Group would be monitoring the airport's sustainability performance as a key element of the Committee's Annual Work Programme (AWP). Benchmarking the airport against both airport and non airport organisations would form an important part of the monitoring process. Action was in hand to develop this work.

The AMT gave a brief presentation about the LAMP project which was designed to improve airspace over the South East. NATS were leading the project and there had been a helpful NTKWG meeting at which it was clear that NATS wished to engage at an early stage to determine the best options affecting Stansted operations. The AMT would be liaising closely with EIG and NTKWG as the project progressed.

Given that some of the issues were technical and not easily understood by the layman, it was agreed that it would be helpful if Members could be provided with a glossary of key terms

ii. User Experience Group – 9 September 2015

The Group had welcomed the re-engagement with **UKBF** and there had been a number of helpful meetings. The Group understood that there were issues affecting the various responsibilities and funding arrangements affecting immigration. It was reported that action was in hand to clarify these issues.

The Group also expressed appreciation of the helpful long service that Alison Lilly had contributed to the Group's work. There still appeared to be issues affecting **the Express Set Down Scheme**. A number of cards appeared to be rejected. The AMT agreed to investigate and report back.

This had allayed concerns of local residents who had considered that the original revised scheme did not reflect the use of the airport as a local transport hub. The revised scheme

now included post codes zones and reduced charges for local residents. There was only one outstanding query relating to the issue of cards. It was not clear whether residents had to apply for new cards or not. The AMT agreed to consider the matter.

There were a number of current **rail** issues principally the West Anglia Task Force and the new control period 2019-2024. There seemed to be common agreement that the existing rail services to and from the airport needed improvement. Efficient and effective rail services were vital both to the airport's expansion and the local and regional economy. It was important that all parties should continue to operate a joined up approach and lobby for improvement as a demonstration of the considerable local and regional support. It was suggested that it might be helpful to hold a meeting of CAG early in the New Year to consider rail issues. In the meantime the Committee would seek to liaise closely with the AMT as the work progressed.

The Group looked forward to its next meeting at which it had been agreed that Karen Smart would provide an update on the Customer Service Improvement Programme.

The Group noted that smoking outside the terminal particularly the doors continued to be a problem and remained ready to liaise with the AMT on possible solutions/

5 UK Border Force

Dean Milton (Assistant Director UKBF Stansted) gave a comprehensive presentation to the Committee. He welcomed the opportunity for UKBF to re-engage with the Committee and planned to ensure the Force's ongoing engagement. He outlined the wide range of services provided by UKBF at Stansted which included border control, customs and smuggling prevention.

Given the significant growth at the airport, the UKBF had faced a challenging year. They had sought to manage this through a number of initiatives. Greater use was being made of a Dynamic Resource Tool which assisted in ensuring best deployment of resources. This had proved very helpful in helping to manage demand on a daily and hourly basis. Additional seasonal staff had been deployed to help manage demand. The UKBF were currently meeting service targets relating to queuing times. UKBF were currently in the process through the business planning round for 2016/17 in bidding for additional resources in line with MAG's predicted growth. The e-gates had also played a key role in helping to manage demand. Efforts were being made to encourage even greater use of the gates. However usage appeared to be determined by personal choice. In some cases it appeared that individuals preferred the human contact to using new technology. Modelling work was underway to determine the number of additional e-gates required. It was expected this would be in the region of 10-15 however the exact number would be confirmed through the modelling process. There was high usage with over 54% of eligible passengers using the gates in September. There had been a successful trial in the summer with UK children aged between 12 and 17 being able to use e-gates with their parents. The scope for extending the trial was currently under review.

There had also been a trial in the summer with the FCO Surge Workforce were used as presenters in the summer to assist in managing increased passenger flow in the Arrivals Hall. This had been successful and there were currently discussions to consider future funding of the presenters.

In discussion, it was suggested that consideration could be given to introducing family only lanes which might help to improve the passenger experience. It was also noted that there was a need to improve signage. It was understood that the UKBF were currently working with the airport to improve signage. The Chairman expressed the Committee's appreciation for the helpful presentation and looked forward to maintaining an active dialogue with UKBF.

Item 6 Airport Growth

The Managing Director updated the Committee on a number of issues relating to the airport's development. The airport had seen significant growth since the change in ownership - this had been a faster rate than had originally been forecast. As part of standard business planning, they were developing a range of business scenarios. At this stage, there were a number of unknown factors which could affect the future direction of the airport's development e.g. the pattern of services and destinations served. For example the introduction of full service airlines would require different terminal facilities to that currently required by the short haul operators.

It was noted that there was considerable economic growth in the region at both ends of the London - Cambridge corridor with a number of major international companies considering relocating to the region. The availability of a wide range of international services could help influence decisions. The airport could play a key role in helping to facilitate growth in the region.

In terms of accommodating growth within existing facilities, it was considered that use could be made of existing capacity at non peak periods for new services. It was noted that freight was also growing and had seen a 9.5% increase over the last year. Freight often provided an early indication of economic activity between regions and lay the foundations for new air links

The Chairman considered that it had been helpful to have a general discussion on the issue and looked forward to the Committee's future engagement with the airport as matters progressed. It would be helpful if the Committee - as appropriate - could be involved upstream as projects developed.

Item 7 Airport Managing Director's Report

The Committee received the quarterly report from the Managing Director. In discussion, the Committee sought clarification of MAG's housing disposal policy. The Managing Director advised the Committee that Saviles had been appointed to assist the airport in the disposal of some of the housing stock. He stressed that this decision should not be seen as having any implications relating to future capacity of the airport

It was also noted that a previous request that information about night flights should be included in the monthly traffic statistics did not appear to have actioned. The AMT agreed to consider and report back

It was also noted that the AMT did not appear to be meeting its targets in responding to noise complaints. The AMT apologised for this and explained that this had resulted from absence through illness of a key member of staff.

Item 8 Future Meeting Dates

The Committee were invited to note the proposed meeting dates for 2016

STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

E-Mail contact: fefamily@blueyonder.co.uk

Website: www.stacc.info

USER EXPERIENCE GROUP

MEETING OF THE USER EXPERIENCE GROUP OF THE STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, HELD AT THE AIRPORT ON 9 DECEMBER 2015

Membership

- * Rufus Barnes (representing surface transport interests) - Chairman
- * Keith Brown (representing tourism interests)
- * Peter Mantle (representing Airline Operators Committee)
- * David Burch (representing commerce and business interests)
Gary Jones (representing local authorities)
- * Peter Lainson (representing PRM interests)
- * Mary Sartin (representing local authorities)
David Leigh (representing cargo interests)
- * Peter Odrich (representing business passengers)
- * Graham McAndrew (representing local authorities)
- * Julie Jones (representing non business passengers)
- * Stewart Ashurst (Chairman of STACC)
- * Danny Purton (representing local authorities)

(* present at meeting)

Also present

Karen Smart - STAL

Chris Wiggan - STAL

Neil Banks - STAL

Kate Newscombe - STAL Steven Foster - MAG Corporate Dean Milton - UK Border Force

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from:

- Angela Alder;
- Frank Evans. The Chairman and UEG sent their best wishes to the Secretary and Technical Adviser for a speedy recovery from his illness.
- Gary Jones

2. NEW MEMBERS

The Chairman welcomed:

- Danny Purton (representing Harlow Council) to his first meeting of UEG.
- Julie Jones to her first meeting of UEG as a full member of STACC as opposed to a co-opted member of UEG. She had succeeded Olivia van Dyk as the representative on STACC of Non Business/Leisure Passenger interests, but would continue to bring to the Committee her expertise as an employee of ABTA.

3. MINUTES

a. Approval of Minutes.

The Minutes of the UEG meeting held on September 9th 2015 were approved by the Group as a correct record. These minutes had been submitted to STACC and endorsed by the Committee at its meeting on October 21 2015

b. Matters Arising

- i. The Chairman reported that he had received a message from Alison Lilly thanking UEG for its good wishes for the future.

ii. Free Set Down.

Concern was expressed about a lack of clarity as to the demarcation of the designated waiting areas in the Mid-Stay car park for people using the free set-down and pick-up facility, because the area is currently also used as the arrivals and departure point for Terravision coach services. It was reported that there had been instances of unacceptable behaviour by Terravision staff. Later in the meeting, Kate Newscombe was able to reassure UEG that the cause of this particular problem was being addressed at the same time as the UEG meeting was being held and that the problem would be quickly resolved – the free set-down and pick-up area was being moved within the Mid-Stay car park to remove the conflict.

STAL mentioned that the Express Set Down Scheme had been modified slightly to comply with data protection requirements and apologised for the delay in processing the pass applications of some UEG members.

4. BORDER FORCE MATTERS

The Chairman welcomed to the UEG meeting Dean Milton, Border Force Stansted Assistant Director. There had been a number of very useful meetings with Mr Milton (his presentation to the previous full STACC meeting had been very well received) and the Chairman was very encouraged that the relationship with Border Force had been restored to the very positive one previously experienced when Bill Form represented Border Force at meetings of UEG. Mr Milton also welcomed the restored relationship with UEG and confirmed that he would be attending UEG meetings in the future.

Mr Milton made a short presentation to the meeting about the broad range of Border Force responsibilities and powers together with an outline of the results achieved. During the presentation and subsequent discussion, some key points included the following: 50% extra space had now been made available by STAL for more e-gates to address the issue of passenger queuing capacity. 15 extra e gates would be installed by June 2016 thereby providing a total of 30 gates available for use – more than at any other airport

terminal in the UK.

Border Force had a distinct preference for automation and was confident that a greater number of e gates would encourage a greater use of them by passengers. There would be new signage assisting passenger awareness and a single point of entry into the queuing area. Border Force and STAL were shortly to trial a 'family only' queue. Mr Milton agreed that there could be some greater clarity in the information provided at the e gate itself as to the precise procedure for placing the passport and for actually passing through the gate. The Dynamic Resource Tool (DRT) continued to provide Border Force with very useful data leading to the real time matching of staffing level requirements at the gates with changing passenger volumes during each day.

About 7-800 queuing measurements had been taken each week since June and there had been a significant reduction in the number of breaches of the Service Level Agreement performance targets, even in peak times. Border Force and STAL were confident that the actual data now existed which could demonstrate that often the public perception of delay was not evidenced in reality. Mr Milton and Karen Smart offered to make available to UEG some performance measurement success data as from June 2015.

Mr Milton confirmed that the work of Border Force was significantly 'intelligence led' and that the main purpose of screening passengers was 'to prevent those from travelling who should not be travelling' either because of the absence of appropriate documentation or for other customs, immigration or security reasons.

5. CUSTOMER SERVICES

Customer Service Strategy.

Karen Smart updated UEG about the emerging content of the overall Strategy. The Customer was to be 'at the heart of the Strategy' and much work was needed to 'know them'. Choice for customers was very important and the implications of this were being considered carefully. Similarly, the customer experience at every stage of her/his journey was crucial and the Strategy would address how this might be enhanced. As most passengers at Stansted were under 30 years old, the importance of digital information and its management could not be overestimated. Work on the strategy was continuing and UEG would be updated regularly.

[Post meeting note: The Chairman of STACC had written to Ms Smart raising concerns about the apparent lack of consultation with STACC on this important strategy]

Customer Improvement Programme.

UEG received an update from Neil Banks. Particular reference was made to the following:

There was a need to address the demands made by 'first wave' capacity pressures (viz in the first six hours of the morning). It was **AGREED** that there would be a full presentation on this issue at the next UEG meeting. There were developments at Satellite I which probably merited a UEG visit.

UEG believed there was a continuing inadequacy of seating – especially for the ambulant unwell. Whilst acknowledging there was no seating in the World Duty Free area, Neil Banks believed STAL had gone quite some way towards providing enough seating – especially with seating marked for priority users. There remained however some disagreement between STAL and UEG about the adequacy of seating provision generally and the distance passengers had to walk from the security check (particularly the fast track security check area) to the main seating area, airside. UEG concluded that the inevitable balance between the interests of the customer as retailer and the interests of the customer as passenger might need to be revisited.

Customer Services Quarterly Report.

UEG received STAL's Quarterly Report (circulated in advance) about Customer Services overall and presented by Neil Banks. It was **AGREED** that there would be a Passenger Projections update at the next UEG meeting.

It was also **AGREED** that at future meetings of UEG there would be an agenda item for the receipt of any individual member's feedback about the customer service experience.

6. PRM MATTERS

'Disabledgo' PRM Guide to Stansted Airport.

Although the Guide was not their publication, nevertheless STAL apologised for not ensuring that UEG (and STACC's PRM representative Peter Lainson in particular) had been consulted prior to its publication. This was seen by UEG as a perhaps small but a very telling example of how meaningful Committee consultation can fall short.

Recent disembarkation experience of UEG Member.

Peter Lainson detailed his recent unpleasant experience with Omniserv in disembarking from a Ryanair aircraft at Stansted. Whilst Mr Lainson had received an apology from Omniserv in respect of its failure to deal properly with his complaint, there appeared to be a number of wider concerns which not only Omniserv but other organisations, including STAL, might need to consider to ensure that PRM passengers are always dealt with in a dignified way. It was noted that STAL already was reviewing its stock of Ambulifts.

It was **RESOLVED** that the STACC Chairman should write to those organisations with an interest in a matter of this kind expressing the Committee's great concern and suggesting that each organisation should take appropriate action to ensure that an experience such as Mr Lainson endured does not happen again.

7. RAIL MATTERS

West Anglia Task Force.

Chris Wiggan updated UEG about recent developments as follows:

The Task Force, chaired by Sir Alan Haslehurst MP had met twice since September. Its purpose was to develop the case for investment; there was a need to set out both an investment business case and also the socio economic rationale. A Communication Protocol was in place for all the Task Force's work.

A phased approach was being considered. The short term comprised National Rail's existing package. The medium term included additional tracking - in particular for the section between Tottenham Hale and Cheshunt - although the cost even for this was

sizeable eg £1bn. The longer term involved Cross Rail 2 and the possibility thereby of opening up greater geographical connectivity. The Task Force wanted to see at least the short and medium term phases progressed quickly.

Rail Franchise.

Chris Wiggan updated UEG as follows:

There were three bidders: First Group, Abellio/Stagecoach and National Express.

[Post meeting note – at the same time as UEG was meeting Stagecoach announced it was pulling out of the alliance with Abellio]

All three bidders were clearly listening to representations made about for example rolling stock and ticketing options.

An announcement as to the successful bidder(s) would be made in June next year.

8. SURFACE ACCESS MATTERS.

STAL confirmed that they were engaged with London Travel Watch in the provision of feedback on the passenger experience at Stansted.

UEG noted that STACC had submitted a response to the Transport Select Committee on Surface Access to Airports. (Copy circulated with the Minutes of the STACC October 21st meeting).

9. RETAIL MATTERS

UEG received a presentation about retail at the airport from Steven Foster, Head of MAG Retail. He outlined the refreshed retail offer in the redeveloped terminal building and the benefits he believed were now offered.

As regards the obligation to show Boarding Passes at the same time as purchases, there was a legal obligation to do so within the World Duty Free area but not elsewhere. Some outlets asked for Passes so as to enable them to justify the reclaiming of VAT to the HMRC on non EU sales.

As for pricing, on fashion and beauty products etc the tax free prices were generally about 15-20% lower than the average High

Street retail prices. Boots currently offered High Street equivalent prices and would soon cease asking for Passes. WH Smith asked for Passes and often charged more expensive prices than on the High Street. The remedy was the need for more competition which Mr Foster was keen to encourage.

10. VISIT TO DUBLIN

The Annual Work Programme approved for UEG in June 2015 stated that one of UEG's objectives should be 'To share the benefits of learning from comparable airports in respect of key elements of the passenger experience.' To this end, the Chairman, Peter Lainson, Peter Odrich and the Secretary and Technical Adviser had visited Dublin airport recently as that airport had often been cited as an example of best practice. The visit had been extremely interesting. Whilst Stansted already equalled much of Dublin's best practice, there were a number of points of particular interest.

There had been an increasing 'civilianisation' of border checking and customs functions at Dublin airport and this had significantly speeded up the handling of passengers. Police members were on hand to deal with problems if they arose, but no members of the civilian staff were taken away from their checking duties as can be the case at Stansted and other ports in the UK. However, decisions as to any 'civilianisation' in the UK would be taken at Government level and not locally.

The Immigration queuing time already met regulatory standards at Dublin airport and the airport's own internal target was to see a maximum of 15 minutes queue time by 2017. (Karen Smart said that, subject to demographics, this would also be the aspiration of MAG at Stansted).

Dublin airport was aggressively marketing itself as a European hub for North America flights with flight connections being promoted from a substantial number of airports in the English Midlands and the north thereof.

The recognition that the emotional position of passengers needs to be taken into account in airport planning - 'People who are happy and calm are more likely to use an airport again'. It was noted that in 2006 Dublin airport was close to the bottom of its group of 15 ppa – 25 ppa airports in terms of passenger satisfaction. It is now in the top 2 or 3. Management policies appeared to be working!

Special arrangements had been introduced to assist people with autism. STAL said that similar arrangements were being developed for Stansted.

11. ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME

At the suggestion of the Chairman, UEG agreed to defer consideration of the Annual Work Programme on the understanding that at the next meeting the matter would be taken as an early item on the agenda.

12. WORKLOAD AND MEETING DATES

UEG considered how best to cope with its growing workload. Following the suggestion of the Chairman, it was **AGREED** that the number of meetings should be increased to five meetings per year and that the Secretary and Technical Adviser would let members know as soon as possible the revised programme of meetings for 2016. Meanwhile but until the revised programme was published, the next meeting of UEG would be held at Enterprise House on March 9th 2016.

DRAFT

STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES GROUP

NOTE OF MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES GROUP HELD AT STANSTED AIRPORT ON 11 NOVEMBER 2015

ATTENDEES

Keith Artus (Chairman)
Graham McAndrew
Jackie Cheetham
Stewart Ashurst
Richard Burrett
Danny Purton

Also present:

Neil Robinson - MAG
Duncan Smith - London Stansted Airport
Kathy Morrissey - London Stansted Airport

Frank Evans (Secretary and Technical Adviser)

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies had been received from Zhanine Oates and Steve Bailes.

2. New Members

The Chairman welcomed Richard Burrett (representing environmental issues) and Danny Purton (representing Harlow District Council) to their first meeting.

3. Notes of previous meetings

The Group confirmed the notes of the meeting held on 29 July 2015. (Copy attached). NB – The notes had been received and endorsed at the STACC meeting on 21 October 2015.

4. Action points

All action points arising from the last meeting were covered under agenda items.

5. Environmental Issues

Kathy Morrissey (AMT) made a presentation to the Group covering a range of environmental issues.

Air quality had been monitored at the airport for a number of years with the main focus on two pollutants (NO₂ and PM₁₀). The results of the monitoring were used to assess whether applicable air quality objectives had been met, and how pollutant concentrations in the area had changed over time. For NO₂, there were two continuous monitors supported by a network of diffusion tube monitors located at the perimeter of the airport. For PM₁₀ there was one continuous monitor located outside the perimeter of the airport. Current indications were that the airport was operating within UK standards. It was noted that with the proposed growth of the airport, it would be important to monitor emission levels in Hatfield Forest and any adverse impacts.

The airport was seeking to minimise emissions with greater use of low emission vehicles (e.g. air-side buses). Action would continue to reduce energy consumption and demand. Substantial savings had been made to date. The aim was to reduce demand for energy by 15% over the five years. Key elements would be to seek to ensure that the upgrading of buildings and facilities would be energy efficient and have reduced emissions. The airport would also be seeking to examine the scope for greater use of renewable fuels. In addition the airport through its Vision Green campaign would continue to engage with staff, contractors and business partners to increase awareness of energy and environmental impacts.

The Group noted that the issue of odours arising from the airport's operations would need to be revisited as the airport grew.

At previous meetings, the Group had also asked for examples of any cases of projects which had been authorised on environmental rather than business case grounds and there had been discussion about the payback period for environmental projects. It had been confirmed that the period was normally three years. The Group had queried as to whether this was a relatively short period for assessing environmental projects and asked whether they could have sight of a list of projects that fell outside the 3 year payback period. The AMT agreed to provide such a list.

6. Alternative metrics

At the previous meeting, the Group had welcomed Dr Hooper's paper which had been informative and interesting. However the Group considered that the paper should be amplified and examine metrics which took in the following factors:-

- the low ambient environment in which Stansted was located;
- the parameters to be used (load factor, number of aircraft movements and passenger numbers);
- the effect of runway direction;
- whether N60 or N70 should be used.

Dr Hooper had subsequently prepared an addendum to his paper which sought to clarify these points. This provided the Group with useful further information. This seemed to point to the need for a range of metrics - perhaps the existing Leq average metrics supplemented by numbers related metrics. The circumstances would be determined by the individual case. Whatever metric was

chosen it needed to be used in a way that was readily understood by the layman. To take this work forward, it was agreed that it would be helpful if the AMT could prepare charts covering

N60 / N70 charts for existing passenger volume for routes covering the pre RNP1 and post RNP1; the combined Dover / CLN projection using RNP1, projections for 35m passengers (RNP1).

The charts should cover day and night operations. As regards periods, it would probably best to opt for the summer as opposed to annual.

There was a brief discussion on noise monitors. It was agreed that further consideration as their location should be deferred until future routeings were determined.

7. Airspace changes

RNP Trial

The Group expressed its further disappointment that it had still not proved possible for Ryanair to participate in the RNP trial. It now appeared that Ryanair had been granted the necessary flight operations approval but needed a further authorisation from the IAA relating to aircraft type rating. The AMT agreed to continue to try and progress the issue. The Group considered that it would be helpful if a timetable could be obtained from the IAA.

RNP Consultation

The AMT advised that the consultation was progressing and there had been a number of local outreach events. This had been helpful in enabling the AMT to provide further clarification about the consultation. The AMT had also posted a video about the consultation on its website. Initial indications were that this had been well received.

LAMP

It was noted that the AMT and the NTKWG had met NATS to consider LAMP developments. It had been agreed that there would be advantage in having early engagement with NATS on possible options. In the past any engagement appeared to have taken place after NATS had finalised the changes.

8. Noise insulation schemes

The Group noted that the SDP contained a commitment to review the existing sound insulation scheme. The AMT advised that this review would be deferred until future routes had been clarified. This would ensure that the scheme could take into account any change in those residents affected.

9. Annual Work Programme (AWP)

i. The Group noted the updated EIG elements in the AWP and the linkage to both the SDP and the CSR.

ii. At the last meeting, the Secretary and Technical Adviser had been asked to prepare a paper on benchmarking covering both aviation and non aviation sectors. This had been produced and was discussed by the Group. The airport's CSR also been published and contained further benchmarking information. This provided the Group with further information to gauge the airport's performance against other airports and sectors. This appeared to indicate that the airport was comparable with some airports but others performed better. It was acknowledged that performance at other airports could be affected by local circumstances. It was agreed that it would be helpful for the next

meeting if the AMT could identify examples of best practice. In particular it would be helpful if the AMT could contact shopping centres such as Westfield and Intu and obtain information about their sustainability policies and performance. Consideration should be given to inviting relevant organisations - both aviation and non aviation- to make presentations to future EIG meetings.

10. Corporate Social Responsibility Report

The Group noted that the airport had published its annual CSR. The Group welcomed the report especially the expanded section on benchmarking.

11. Environmental Strategy

The Group considered that it would seeking further environmental presentations from the AMT until work on benchmarking had been progressed

12. Date of Next Meeting

10 February 2016

ACTION POINTS

Environmental issues

- The AMT to provide a list of projects that fell outside the 3 year payback period.

Noise metrics

- The AMT to produce N60 / N70 charts for existing passenger volume for routes covering the pre RNP1 and post RNP1;the combined Dover / CLN projection using RNP1, projections for 35m passengers (RNP1).

Airspace

- The AMT agreed to continue to try and progress the issue of Ryanair's participation in the RNP trial.
- The AMT to pursue the issue of obtaining a timetable could be obtained from the IAA.

Benchmarking

- The AMT to identify examples of best practice.
- The AMT to contact shopping centres such as Westfield and Intu and obtain information about their sustainability policies and performance.
- The AMT to give consideration to inviting relevant organisations - both aviation and non aviation- to make presentations to future EIG meetings.

STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

STACC BIENNIAL AWAYDAY (Paper from Chairman)

In recent times, every two years in the Spring, there has been a STACC Awayday - or rather an Away morning - held for STACC members only and held away from the airport site. We have tended to consider one or two substantive matters and then a few 'house-keeping' matters. It has always been quite an informal session.

We need to decide whether we would like to hold an Awayday this year and if we do, what we might discuss and preferably on what date the Awayday should be held. One view is that we don't need to hold an Awayday as such now and that any substantive matters for lengthy discussion should either come to ordinary STACC meetings in the usual way or be the subject of an *ad hoc* special meeting. The same should apply to 'housekeeping' matters or that these could be resolved outside any meetings. Conversely, there is a view that an Awayday provides an opportunity to discuss some matters in greater depth (and at greater length) than would ordinarily be the case at a scheduled meeting and to air any 'sensitive' matters. STAL would not be present and 'Chatham House Rules' would apply - as in the past.

If we were to hold the Awayday, what might we discuss? Examples could include:

- a) a better understanding of how and where the airport fits into developing the economy of the region and equally, what role STACC might play. In this subject, it would be useful to have an update about the national and more local planning framework, about current major infrastructure proposals and about economic development in the region generally. (This subject almost certainly would require some form of outside presentation which however might take time to organise).
- b) what consulting STACC should mean in practice. After the last Awayday, I drafted a report on consultation principles. Building on these, it might be useful to discuss in greater detail *what in practice should be the actual consultation arrangements and protocols* as between STACC and STAL. This is not as fluffy a subject as it might read!
- c) the emerging MAG/STAL Customer Strategy and what this means in practice for each stage of the outward bound and inward bound passenger experience. This might depend on the availability of an appropriate MAG draft Customer Strategy and would benefit from a contribution from STAL.

These are just some possibilities but I hope members might suggest others.

Question 1: Should we hold an Awayday this year or should we not?

Question 2: If we are to hold an Awayday, what main issues should we discuss?

Question 3: If we are to hold an Awayday this year, should it be held in the Spring or at later date in the year?

Question 4: If we are to hold an Awayday, are members content that we return to Thremhall Park for a session beginning at 9am, a mid morning coffee break and ending with a buffet lunch at about 1pm?

Question 5: Are members content with an email canvassing of dates for the Awayday by the Secretary and Technical Adviser with the date selected being the one the majority say suits them best?

Stewart Ashurst
Chairman
January 2016