

DRAFT

STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 APRIL 2018
AT THE AEROZONE, STANSTED AIRPORT**

ATTENDANCE

Chairman – Shena Winning*

Users of Airport

Freight interests (1) – David Leigh*

Passenger airline companies (2) Chris Hughes

Business passengers (1) - Peter Odrich

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

Non Business passengers (1) Julie Jones

Local authorities

Braintree District Council (1) – Hylton Johnson*

East Hertfordshire District Council (1) – Gary Jones

Epping Forest District Council (1) - Mary Sartin*

Essex County Council (1) – Simon Walsh

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) –

Hertfordshire Association of Local and Parish Councils - Angela Alder *

Stop Stansted Expansion (1) - Brian Ross*

Commerce and Business interests (1) – Haydon Yates*

Tourism interests (1) –

Surface transport interests (1) – Rufus Barnes*

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

Also present at the meeting

Frank Evans - Secretary and Technical Adviser to STACC

Representing Stansted Airport Limited (STAL)

Brad Miller - Chief Operating Officer*(Deputising for Ken O'Toole)

Neil Robinson - Corporate Responsibility Director*

Paul Willis - STAL*

William Hall - STAL*

John Twigg - MAG*

Alistair Andrew - MAG*

Essex County Council

Anne Clitheroe - Principal Spatial Planner

1. Apologies for Absence and Deputising Attenders

Members

Peter Odrich, Peter Lainson, Julie Jones, Danny Purton, Gary Jones, Graham McAndrew Simon Walsh and Jackie Cheetham

Observers

Ken O'Toole and Chris Wiggan.

2. Minutes

The Committee approved as a correct record the draft Minutes of the Committee meeting held on January 24 2018.

a. Matters Arising

i. The Chairman advised that she had been made aware after the January meeting that a member of the public had made a tape recording of the meeting. She requested that no recordings should be made at meetings.

ii. The Chairman said that the Secretary had received a Question from a member of the public relating to the conflict of interests issue which had been raised at the January meeting. This was an issue that required proper consideration. Accordingly it would be discussed at the Annual Meeting in June.

b. All other outstanding matters recorded in the Minutes of the previous meeting had been itemised and considered elsewhere on the agenda.

3. Public Question Time

(i) Cllr Andy Bennett

"Are STAL and STACC yet ready to take the initiative to show some genuine concern towards their local communities by calling on the CAA and NATS to reverse the flightpath changes made two years ago, which have greatly increased the noise impacts – day and night – for so many local residents, or are you forever going to hide behind the CAA, NATS and the argument that complaints are not a reflection of community impact?"

(ii) Robert Beer

"In light of the change being sought by Stansted's owners, Manchester Airport Group (MAG), buried deep in their current Uttlesford planning application in Appendix D of the Planning Statement, namely to remove the present S. 106 restriction under NOISE which prevents Stansted Airport lobbying Government for more night flights.

Can the MD/CEO of STAL please answer the following question and related issues arising

- What is STAL's intent in requesting this exclusion and why have they not been upfront about this request? Can STAL now give a real answer to the question asked at the last meeting of STACC relating to, inter alia, the future number of night flights as it affects Noise Action Plans under DEFRA?

- When will STAL engage in a realistic way with Communities acknowledging they have a major issue over NOISE pollution and put in place with NATS some co-sponsored initiatives to alleviate this major and growing problem? Stansted since 1986 had 6 Noise Preferential Routes; reduced to effectively 4 by a joint STAL/NATS initiative.

It is a nonsense that they remain at 4 currently with no intent to increase them.

When will STAL face up to its Corporate responsibility in dealing with these and other pollution issues in a way that benefits the local communities?

Can the Chair of STACC please ensure that these and other questions asked at STACC are answered by STAL a serious manner and are not, as has become the norm, treated in a dismissive and discourteous manner."

i. The Chairman suggested that, as the above two questions covered similar issues, it was planned to handle these together. Both questioners agreed to this approach. The Chairman prefaced the AMT's response by stating that she rejected the last part of Mr Beer's question suggesting that the airport treated public questions in a dismissive and discourteous manner. STAL responded to questions in an appropriate manner.

ii. In response, the AMT advised the following :-

- There had been evidence of an encouraging number of initiatives - both at industry and local level to minimise noise impacts. At Stansted despite the increase in the number of flights, there had been a reduction of 13% in the noise footprint. Airlines were operating modern noise efficient aircraft. Fleet replacement plans would bring even quieter aircraft. The current planning application sought to mitigate noise impacts whilst maintaining the current number of permitted flights. New technology provided an opportunity to help manage the noise climate. Where complying with safety requirements, aircraft were encouraged to climb higher and faster bringing noise benefits

- There had been changes in the distribution of flights - the Dover/Clacton route - a NATS driven airspace change. Such changes presented sponsors with challenges in balancing the benefits and impacts for communities. Whilst reducing impacts for some communities, changes could result in increased impacts for others who had not previously been overflown.

- As regards night flights, there were limits which were set by central government. The current regime ran from October 2017-2022. The limit was for 13,700 flights a year. These limits would not be affected by the planning application which did not propose any increase in the number of night flights. STAL were however seeking to amend the S.106 agreement which currently prevented the airport from lobbying for an increase in night flights. The purpose of the proposed amendment was to enable the airport to participate in future consultations about night flights.

iii. With regard to the Dover/Clacton route switch, the EIG Chairman commented that STACC - through EIG - had been opposed to the route switch. In addition to formally opposing the change in the Group's response to the consultation, he had written to the CAA on several occasions advocating that the CAA reverse the change on the grounds that the proposals had not fulfilled its objectives eg on reducing delays and reducing emissions. The local perception was that flights had doubled and produced new noise impacts. He was currently awaiting the CAA to publish its Post Implementation Review of the change. He would continue to pursue the matter vigorously.

EIG would also continue to advocate changes and initiatives which could result in benefits for local residents.

iv. Mr Bennett said residents were frustrated that the airport seemed to be hiding behind the CAA and NATS on this issue. Mr Beer said that in his view the change had resulted in the number of Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) being reduced from 6 to 4. This was unacceptable and there was a need to consider new NPRs. In response it was noted that NPRs for the three London noise designated airports (Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted) were set and controlled by Government.

(iii) Mr John Devoti

“ It has been stated many times by Stansted Airport (Manchester Airport Group) that they take their responsibilities to the local community seriously and will support the people who have been most badly affected by the airport's operation. Further airport expansion is planned but Stansted Airport still hasn't honoured its compensation obligations from almost 20 years ago. Will Stansted Airport agree to settle all outstanding compensation claims for the blight on local residential properties before going ahead with any further expansion? My wife, and the Howe Green Residents of Great Hallingbury still wish to ask the following. We are advised by our land agents that Stansted Airport (MAG) are still prevaricating in settling the matter of compensation. Why? ”

i. The AMT advised that the airport was continuing to seek a fair and reasonable solution. It had been a lengthy process but they were optimistic that they would be able to report considerable progress by the June STACC meeting. In accordance with past practice, STACC was not a forum to debate the merits of individual cases. The AMT would be willing to discuss Mr Devoti's case offline outside the meeting. The AMT had taken a number of actions since the last meeting. They had sought to contact all claimants and issued a revised guide to residents. They had undertaken to consider claims from former residents. The deadline date for claims had been extended to July 2019. There had been ongoing productive discussions both with the agents and individual claimants.

ii. The Chairman commented that the Committee had made considerable efforts to encourage engagement between the airport and claimants and she was hopeful that the matter could be progressed by the June meeting. Mr Devoti noted that the meeting had been advised two years ago that the issue would be settled promptly. However two years later the issues was still going on.

4. Working Groups : Reports of meeting

i. Environmental Issues Group - 21 February 2018

The Committee received and endorsed the Notes of the meeting held on 21 February 2018. The key issues covered by the February meeting included:

- The extension of PBN to westerly departures. It was noted that this was likely to be a long process.
- The Group looked forward to assisting in the airport's revision of the noise action plan with an opportunity to review the draft plan before it was published for consultation. In discussion, it was noted that the original plan had been subject to extensive public consultation and agreed by STACC. Given that the plan had to be submitted to Government by early summer, it appeared that the consultation exercise would have to be shortened with no opportunity for STACC to review. The AMT explained that, given the outcome of the planning application would influence the content of the action plan, they had approached Defra and the DFT and it had been agreed that the plan would now be submitted to government later in the autumn in time for it to be submitted to the EU in January 2019. This extension would provide an opportunity for consultation with EIG and discussion by STACC at its October meeting.

ii. User Experience Group - 7 February and 28 March 2018

The Committee received and endorsed the minutes of the meetings held on 7 February and 28 March 2018. The key issues covered by these meetings included:

- An update on coach station signage. It was planned for introduction by the end of May. The UEG Chairman would be undertaking a site visit.
- The Group had concerns about the lack of progress in the development of a Customer Service Strategy. There had been a number of preliminary iterations in the past but little progress had been achieved.
- The meeting on 28 March received a helpful presentation on freight services at the airport
- The Group received updates on PRM issues and the transformation project.

iii. Corporate Affairs Group

- The Group had not met since the January STACC meeting

iv. Joint EIG/ UEG meeting

- There had been a joint meeting on 23 March to consider surface access issues arising from the planning application. This is further discussed under Item 7.

5. Airport Transformation Project -

The Meeting received a detailed presentation from the AMT on the project. (copy of slides attached). In discussion, members made a number of points:-

- It was important the the iconic nature of the building (designed by Norman Foster) was preserved. It was explained that the new arrivals Hall would be at lower level and the terminal building would continue to be the predominate view
- Baggage reclaim would cover both international and domestic arrivals, thus providing greater flexibility
- There would be more seating in the International Departure Lounge (IDL).
- Changes to he existing snake arrangements requiring all passengers to go through the duty free area were being considered.
- Retail outlets in the IDL were being reviewed to reflect the changing needs of passengers. Current experience was that passengers required food and beverage outlets rater than duty free shops.
- It was important the needs of PRM passengers were fully taken into account in the project
- There would also be a number of airside operational developments as part of the project
- The AMT planned to engage regularly with UEG and other stakeholders.

6. Airport Management Matters

The meeting received the report of the Chief Executive together with traffic statistics for the January - March 2018 period. This was presented by the Chief Operating Officer.

The following issues were covered by the report:-

- There had been number of senior management changes;
- The airport had submitted a planning application to Uttlesford District Council seeking permission to raise the existing passenger limits to 43mppa;
- New services to the US and Middle East were being introduced;
- There had been a bus fire on 30 March which had received both national and local media attention. The airport team had acted quickly in getting the fire under control and evacuating passengers. Members suggested that similar buses in London had developed engines fires. The AMT advised that the cause of the fire had been a wiring not engine issue. It was also suggested that the opening of the terminal doors had enabled smoke to spread into the building. Members asked whether the availability of more fire extinguishers would have helped in controlling the situation. The AMT advised that the fire sped very rapidly and would not have been put out more quickly by the use of additional extinguishers. Members suggested that there may have been security implications resulting from the opening of doors in the terminal. Members had welcomed the use of social media to update passengers. However this appeared to shut down at 8pm. The AMT noted these points and advised that the incident was being reviewed to consider whether there were any learning experiences to be gained.
- Members noted that there had been little use of funds from the Community Trust and suggested that there was a case for reviewing the existing criteria to permit greater use.

7. Planning Application and Surface Access

The Committee received and approved a paper by the Secretary and Technical Adviser. The paper reflected the outcome of a joint EIG/UEG meeting held on 23 March. It was agreed that the Chairman - in response to the planning application - should write to UDC reflecting the Committee's concerns about surface access. (**Secretary's note - a letter was subsequently submitted to UDC on 30 April. A copy is annexed to these minutes**). It was also agreed that

action should be put in hand to obtain details of local and related plans to assist the Committee in its further consideration of the issue.

8. Aviation Strategy

The Committee received an information paper on the recent announcement by the Department for Transport on the the development of an aviation strategy. It was agreed that this should be further considered by both EIG and UEG, including the ability to participate in focus groups. It was noted that the Department's draft policy statement on aviation was due to be published in the summer possibly before the next meeting of STACC. It was agreed that this should be discussed by the Committee.

9. Annual Meeting of UK Airport Consultative Committees

Members noted that the Chairman and the Secretary and Technical Adviser were planning to attend the annual meeting to be held at Heathrow on 6 and 7 June. Detailed papers for the meeting had yet to be received. Any papers requiring a STACC view would be circulated to Members in advance of the meeting.

10. Membership

Members noted that there were a number of gaps in the existing membership e.g. from the airline operational side. There are other vacancies. The meeting was advised that the Chairman and Secretary were currently considering options for new members.

11. Date of next meeting

Members are invited to note that the next meeting of the Committee will be the Annual Meeting to be held on June 27th 2018.