

DRAFT

**STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
CORPORATE AFFAIRS GROUP**

**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 4 JULY 2017 AT ENTERPRISE
HOUSE, STANSTED AIRPORT**

ATTENDANCE

Chairman – Shena Winning

**Rufus Barnes
Keith Artus
Brian Ross
Gary Jones
Haydon Yates
Mary Sartin
Peter Lainson
Danny Purton
Jackie Cheetham**

-
Also present at the meeting

Frank Evans - Secretary and Technical Adviser to STACC

Representing Stansted Airport Limited (STAL)

Chris Wiggan - Head of External Affairs *

John Twigg - MAG*

Alistair Andrew - MAG*

AGENDA

The meeting had been arranged to discuss two items - future development at Stansted and the Group's 2017/18 Annual Work Programme (AWP).

1. Future Development at Stansted

The Airport Management Team (AMT) had requested the meeting to provide the meeting with details of its approach to their application to increase the existing planning cap from 35 mppa to 44.5 mppa and seek the Group's views at this stage. The AMT also wished to seek views on possible areas of mitigation.

The AMT outlined the background to the application - the airport was experiencing continuing growth. Passenger numbers were expected to reach 25 million in July 2017 and the planning cap of 35 million by 2023/24. The airport was also experiencing year on year growth in cargo tonnage. The application aimed to make full use of the runway in line with the Airports Commission's recommendation.

The AMT explained that this meeting was initial engagement. It was not a consultation on the planning documents. Feedback from the meeting would help to shape and inform the airport's thinking.

The AMT had submitted a scoping report to the planning authority - Uttlesford District Council (UDC). The scoping report was required to set out how impacts would be assessed and the methodology to be used. The assessment covered the 12 year period up to 2029.

Submission of the scoping document would allow the UDC to clarify what it considered to be the main effects of the development. It was obliged to consult statutory consultees - the Environment Agency and Natural England. There was a five week consultation period which was due to close at the end of the week.

The AMT explained that it was consulting key stakeholders and would be holding a number of drop in events in the local community. In addition all relevant material would be available on the airport's website.

In discussion, members made a number of points;

- The consultation period of five weeks appeared very short. It was noted that the five week deadline was the council's requirement. However the AMT suggested that the Council might apply reasonable flexibility and be amenable to an extension. In discussion it was stressed that the existing timetable did not take into account the fact that many parish councils only met on a monthly basis. It was also the summer holiday period which would affect the public's ability to attend the community events. The AMT explained that the airport had written to over 32,000 households and parish councils and advertised the events in the local press. The AMT were urged to extend the consultation period at least until the end of August. In response, they advised that they were prepared to discuss the issue with UDC and adopt a flexible approach, The AMT agreed to respond to the Group after further discussion with UDC.
- Members highlighted the difference between the previous application made by BAA to increase the cap from 25mppa to 35 mppa with the current application. The process surrounding the current application appeared to be much shorter in terms of timescale and less comprehensive. The AMT suggested that the procedure had changed over the years. It was also important to re-

alise that the current engagement only covered the scoping document and was not a full planning application.

- Members note that the increase in the proposed planning cap of approximately 9.5 mppa meant that the application could be determined locally rather than be treated as a National Strategic Infrastructure Project (NSIP). However it was noted that there was the option of asking the DCLG Secretary of State to call in the application.
- In terms of the location of the drop in events, Members suggested that there should be an event in the Harlow area. This had been raised at the previous week's STACC. The AMT agreed to consider further.
- Members suggested that it would be helpful if the Group could receive a feedback report from the AMT as to the outcome of the consultation. Members were also encouraged to attend the events to gain first hand experience of the consultation.
- It was stressed that any information produced to explain the scoping document should be user friendly and in a form that could be readily understood by the layman. For example it was noted that there were a number of existing multi-tiered S106 agreements which were not easily understood. It would be helpful if the AMT could provide a summary of existing S 106 agreements. Looking forward, it would also be helpful if future agreements could be simplified and easily understood. It would also be helpful if there were published monitoring reports on the agreements.

2. Mitigation

Members were invited to comment on possible areas of mitigation:-

- One suggestion was that there should be a ban on night flights. However other members pointed to the need for the Group to consider all stakeholders. It was right that a balance should be made between the economic benefits and the environmental disbenefits. However night flights tend to be cargo flights and made an important contribution to the local and national economy.
- It was important that growth at the airport should be matched by appropriate developments in public transport. The airport currently had a Public Transport Rate (PTR) was commendably high at over 50%. The aim should be to maintain this level of public transport usage. Rail access should be addressed. Whilst improvements were planned to introduce 12 car trains, the main constraint was the single tunnel providing rail access into the airport. Capacity could be increased with provision of a second tunnel. It was also noted the the Stansted Express did not operate during the night. This meant that some passengers needing to catch early flights had to spend the night in the termi-

nal and sleep on the floor. A 24 hour service was desirable. As regards coach services, there needed to be adequate terminals at both ends of the route to ensure a satisfactory passenger experience. Members also reminded the AMT that the airport provided a valuable local transport hub. This should be taken into account in determining future public transport demand.

- It was suggested that other transport modes eg rail were employing blue sky thinking in helping to improve the passenger experience. There might be value in considering whether initiatives in other transport modes could be applied in the aviation sector.
- The AMT might also wish to consider how other airports both in the UK and Europe operated and whether there were any lessons that could be learnt.
- Any development needed to have regard to its possible impact on ecological systems in the area. For example, Hatfield Forest was a site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

3. Annual Work Programme (AWP)

There was a brief discussion as to priorities for the Group's 2017/18 AWP. These suggested that the following might be appropriate:-

- a) Monitor the planning application as it develops;
- b) Monitor the STAL Sustainable Development Plan (SDP);
- c) Consider the role of the airport as a key driver in the economic development of the Region;
- d) Take an overview of the benchmarking conducted by EIG and UEG;
- e) Monitor monitoring STACC's Annual Budget.

4. Date Of Next Meeting

It was agreed that it would be helpful if the Group could meet in the near future preferably once the feedback report on the consultation was available. The Secretary and Technical Adviser would canvass dates appropriate.

Action points

1. The AMT agreed to arrange meeting in Harlow to cover residents in the Harlow and Epping Forest areas.
2. The AMT agreed to provide a summary of existing S 106 Agreements.
3. The Group would welcome feedback on the community engagement meetings.
4. The Group would welcome a greater understanding of the timescales for the conclusion of the consultation on the environmental scoping statement.