

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 6.30 pm on 2 OCTOBER 2002**

Present:- Councillor A C Streeter – Chairman.
Councillors Mrs J F Cheetham, A Dean, M L Foley,
Mrs E J Godwin, R A Merrion, G Sell and P A Wilcock.

Also present:- Councillors A J Ketteridge, P G F Lewis, Mrs J E Menell and
R W L Stone.

Officers in attendance:- W Cockerell, R Harborough, B D Perkins and
M T Purkiss.

SA17 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs M A Caton and
R C Smith.

SA18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Mrs J F Cheetham, A Dean, Mrs E J Godwin, A C Streeter and
P A Wilcock declared their interests as members of SSE.

SA19 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Panel held on 17 September 2002
were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

SA20 BUSINESS ARISING

(i) Minute SA15(ii) Public Meetings and Consultation

In response to questions from Councillor Mrs Cheetham, the Director of
Community Services confirmed that the Chief Executive had written to the
Department for Transport requesting that the consultation period be extended.
The Leader had also written requesting that the public exhibitions should
return to this area. No formal response had been received to either letter at
this stage.

Councillor A Dean added that the Department for Transport had agreed to
provide further exhibitions in the Cliffe area on 4 and 5 October. He
suggested that, if the DfT agreed to provide further exhibitions for Stansted,
they should be more accessible to people from the areas most affected.

(ii) Minute SA15(ii) Future Meetings

The Director of Community Services said that a representative of the
Council's public relations consultants would attend the next meeting of the
Advisory Panel. It was agreed that the meeting on 14 October 2002 would be

held at 7.30 pm at Saffron Walden and that it would take the form of an informal workshop meeting, to which all Members would be invited.

SA21

FORMULATION OF REASONS FOR NO ADDITIONAL RUNWAYS AT STANSTED

The Advisory Panel considered a discussion paper, which had been prepared by Officers, setting out the outline of a case which could be used to oppose more runways at Stansted. The paper considered whether there was a need for additional runways at Stansted and then addressed the following issues:

Urbanisation	Road and Rail
Noise	Air Traffic Control
Listed buildings	Scheduled Ancient Monuments
Archaeology	Protected Lanes
Landscape	Agriculture
Ecology	Water

In response to a question from Councillor Wilcock, officers agreed that, in the response to Government, it would be necessary to make observations about the general aviation picture and this would be discussed later.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham said that officers needed to look at the statement made by the Secretary of State following the RUCATSE report to see if this had any impact on the conclusions of the earlier white paper.

In relation to the need for additional runways at Stansted, officers said that the response would develop the role of regional and European airports to meet future demand.

With regard to the urbanisation implications the Principal Planning Officer said that it was important for the Council to respond to the East of England Local Government Conference document entitled "East of England: Your Region, Your Choice, Your Future – Regional Planning Guidance (RPG14)" and to put forward a scenario for the right planning solutions for future development in this region. It was within this more strategic, comprehensive context that any further airport development in the region should be considered.

Members felt that the issues of low unemployment, the lack of any need for regeneration and the impact of urbanisation in a rural area were strong arguments against the Stansted proposals. It was also suggested that attention should be drawn to the problems caused by an area relying on a dominant single industry. Councillor Foley referred to previous situations where new development had been created to bring labour to the area but had created unemployment in the longer term as other family members sought employment.

Members also felt that there was a strong argument in not destroying the uniqueness of Cambridge and the surrounding area, which currently attracted business and residents.

The Advisory Panel then considered the road and rail implications. It was felt that the infrastructure requirements needed to be quantified more precisely and should include reference to costs and the amount of land required to provide the infrastructure. It was also noted that the consultation document contained discrepancies in relation to costs and other issues. The document contained a great deal of information about the airports themselves but not the infrastructure requirements.

Councillor Sell said that the rail service to London could not cope with existing demands and would be unable to meet the huge increase which would result from these proposals.

Councillor A Dean considered that the Government should be challenged over the estimates of the population affected by noise and the Council needed to emphasise the issue of low ambient noise levels in this area.

A number of Members referred to potential health problems, e.g. respiratory, the ability of hospitals to cope with large increases in population and the impact of airports on children's educational attainment. It was noted that the Council was working with the Primary Care Trust on developing these health issues. The Advisory Panel agreed that there should be specific reference to the issue of health. Officers reported that English Heritage had expressed concern that the description of the listed buildings in the consultation document did not adequately describe their value or significance. A quarter of all listed buildings in Essex were situated in Uttlesford and, whilst a large number would be lost, many more listed buildings would be adversely affected by the proposals.

The Advisory Panel noted that protected lanes and long distance footpaths were not listed in the consultation document and these would be adversely affected by the proposals. Also, more woodland sites would be lost with the Stansted proposals than in any of the other options. Members agreed that these points needed to be addressed in the response, taking into account the inevitable impact in the surrounding area outside any proposed airport boundary. It was felt that the response should include photographs to emphasise the importance of areas that would be adversely affected. Officers agreed to examine the impact of the proposals on Common Land and Village Greens within the area.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham said that the response to Government should urge that, whatever national solution was arrived at, compensation should be adequate and should be paid promptly.

The Director of Community Services said that, at a future meeting, Members would need to take a view on the content, length and style of the response to Government. He said that the Council's public relation consultants had suggested that Members should fill in the DfT questionnaire. This issue could be raised with a representative of the consultants at the next meeting and the agenda would also include an update on the officer discussion paper and the strategic debate.

SA22

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Councillor Ketteridge said that he was concerned that there was a feeling with some Members of the public that the decision to approve the increase in capacity at the Airport to 25mppa had prejudiced the Council's response to further runways. He also said that he was pleased with the joint letter from group leaders but was disappointed with some divisive material which had been produced by others. He suggested that Council buildings and vehicles should carry posters opposing further runways at Stansted and this would help to make the Council's position clear. Other Members felt that the political parties should be working together on these issues and particularly in getting reminders out about completing the ballot paper and the DfT questionnaire. In response to a further question, the Director of Community Services said that the issue of a "pledge card" would be discussed with the Council's consultants on 4 October.

SA23

CONFERENCE ORGANISED BY THOSE CAMPAIGNING AGAINST AIRPORT EXPANSION

Councillor Wilcock reported on a conference which he had attended with Councillor Mrs Cheetham at City Hall, London on 28 September 2002. The Conference had been called by the London Assembly and had involved representatives of the DfT and community groups.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm