

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES
HIGH STREET GREAT DUNMOW at 5.00 pm on 12 NOVEMBER 2002**

Present:- Councillor Mrs J F Cheetham – Vice Chairman in the Chair
Councillors Mrs M A Caton, A Dean, M L Foley,
Mrs E J Godwin, R A Merrion and G Sell.

Also present:- Councillors Mrs C A Cant, R J Copping, Mrs S Flack,
P G F Lewis, Mrs C M Little, R J Stone and A R Thawley.

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

SA48 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R C Smith,
A C Streeter and P A Wilcock.

SA49 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs M A Caton, Mrs J F Cheetham, A Dean, M L Foley,
Mrs E J Godwin, P G F Lewis, Mrs C M Little, R A E Merrion, G Sell and
A R Thawley declared their interests as members of SSE.

SA50 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Panel held on 30 October 2002
were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

SA51 DRAFT RESPONSE TO DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT

The Advisory Panel considered part of the suggested draft response to the
Department for Transport which set out the reasons why additional runway
capacity at Stansted did not fit into an acceptable new airport policy for the
UK. The Director of Community Services explained that the response to the
DfT would be in two parts. The first part would deal with the national aviation
issues eg environmental controls and the second part would relate specifically
to issues why Stansted was not an acceptable option for additional runways.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham emphasised that the Stansted option would have
little direct benefit to the Thames Gateway Regeneration area whereas Cliffe
would have some advantages. She stressed that the noise factor and the
position of the proposed additional runway at Stansted were particularly
detrimental and needed to be highlighted in the response to Government.

Councillor A Dean suggested that paragraphs needed to be added on the
history of Public Inquiries since the 1960's where independent studies had
consistently recommended that there should be no more runways at Stansted.

Councillor Sell said that the response to the Government should be limited to about 20 pages with other information and references to support the case attached as appendices.

A number of Members suggested that parts of the response relating to employment, water supply, land loss, noise, pollution and the inability of rail services needed to be developed further.

It was also the general view that the case against aircraft noise needed to be made much stronger and should refer to the impact on homes and schools. It needed to be clarified that the figures in the response on noise were average levels and, at times, these would be much higher and intrusive. The low ambient noise level within the area also needed to be highlighted. It was suggested that the response should include some information from the PCT response on health implications.

Stansted had a particularly strong case in relation to the environment and it needed to be emphasised that 1% of the listed building in the country were located within Uttlesford. The importance of wildlife in the protected lanes which would be affected should also be emphasised.

Councillor Copping said that the overall response should be made in a bullet point layout rather than too much text and there should be a section highlighting instances where the airport and the infrastructure were already unable to cope with existing capacity eg the A120, rail services, attracting employees and problems with hospitals and the utilities.

It was suggested that the status of Hatfield Forest should be clarified. Councillor Mrs Cant added that the PCT had stated that health impact studies should be carried out on all the sites at this stage to help inform the Government's decision.

The Director of Community Services said that the points raised by Members at the meeting tonight would be taken onboard and additional paragraphs would be included on air traffic control and reference would also be made to the consultation process. The revised draft would be sent to all Members who would be invited to the next meeting on 18 November 2002.

SA52

OTHER ISSUES

The Director of Community Services said that the referendum result would be delivered to 10 Downing Street on 19 November 2002 and all Members would be invited to attend. A coach would be arranged and an ad van would accompany the delivery of the referendum result. He said that the Government had not agreed to provide questionnaires to all electors in Uttlesford and there would be no visit from Alastair Darling. Adverts would be included in the local papers over a four week period encouraging people to write to the Secretary of State. He said that he was hoping that a general consensus with all Essex authorities could be agreed on no more runways at Stansted but the real challenge would be to persuade the various regional bodies.

The Chairman thanked officers for the excellent work which they had carried out to date on the campaign and the draft response to Government.

SA53

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held on 18 November 2002 at 6.30 pm at Saffron Walden.

The meeting ended at 7.00 pm