

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.30pm on 25 JULY 2005**

Present: Councillor P A Wilcock – Chairman.
Councillors C A Cant, R M Lemon, G Sell, A R Thawley and
A M Wattebot.

Officers in attendance: V Borges, W Cockerell and R Harborough.

SA1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors K R Artus,
J F Cheetham, D Corke, A Dean, M L Foley and E J Godwin.

SA2 BUSINESS ARISING

**(i) Minute SA102 – BAA Stansted – Presentation on Business
Development and Planning Issues**

Councillor Wilcock informed the Panel that he had asked BAA to provide the
Panel in future with a written report before the meeting in order for the Panel
to prepare some questions.

**(ii) Minute SA105 – DEFRA Consultation on Implementation of the
Environmental Noise Directive (2002/49/EC)**

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager informed the Panel that the
response had been submitted and a copy would be circulated to Members.

**SA3 CAA CONSULTATION ON ITS PROPOSED REGULATORY TREATMENT
OF PRELIMINARY EXPENDITURE ON NEW RUNWAY CAPACITY AT
STANSTED**

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager presented the report to the
Panel, which informed Members that the CAA had announced further
consultation on its proposal of regulatory treatment of preliminary expenditure
on new runway capacity at Stansted. He explained that the proposal was
designed to encourage investment and also to protect users against over
investment. Subject to safeguards, which related to consultation by BAA on
proposed expenditure before it was incurred, information disclosure, the
additionality of the proposed expenditure, and the excess of outturn capital
expenditure on addressing blight, professional fees and BAA's project costs
would be taken into account in setting user charge caps applying from 2008.
He added that CAA had emphasised that any legitimate initial costs of the
new runway development at Stansted would not be taken into account in
setting charges caps for Heathrow or Gatwick users.

CAA's document reviewed responses to its initial options consultation and
Ryanair had argued that it was inappropriate to force airport users to pay for
external facilities such as road and rail links and instead they should be paid

for by their own users or not at all. CAA's view on this was that sizeable airport developments in the UK had to be associated with surface access improvements if they were to secure planning permission. Under these circumstances it said that it seemed reasonable for BAA to undertake studies to determine the range of options including the question of how such charges may be defrayed from charges to passengers actually using the facilities, or from third parties such as the Government.

He suggested that, whilst the Council was interested in the outcome of the CAA's economic regulation processes particularly as it might affect BAA's decision as to when it may invest in a second runway, it should confine any representations to the planning issues. He said that the Council should confirm to the CAA that surface access studies were necessary to determine the road and rail options and their effects, and to establish the extent to which enhancements were needed to cope with additional passengers travelling to and from Stansted or also to contribute to supporting wider growth plans.

Councillors questioned the need for a large terminal that passengers would not necessarily want but would have to pay for the privilege of using.

SA4

DfT CONSULTATION ON NIGHT NOISE RESTRICTIONS

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager informed the Committee of the DfT's environmental objectives proposal for the medium to longer term at Stansted to 2030 and "somewhat beyond".

He explained the noise abatement objectives for night time over the six years of the new regime were to limit sleep disturbance, which resulted from overflight of the noisiest types of aircraft, and to mitigate the effects. He went on to explain the proposed Stansted specific night noise abatement objectives were to limit the night quota period (2330 – 0600) 48 dBALeq contour (for the winter and summer season combined) to 38 sq km by 2011 – 12. He added that the DfT's preference was that the 6.5 hour night quota period would be retained. However if the night quota period was to be extended to apply from 2300 to 0700 then the DfT had indicated that different noise abatement objectives would be set, but this was not the DfT's preference. He informed the Panel that if the night quota period was extended it would be essential to ensure that there were safeguards to avoid a situation where this only provided more flexibility to operators to fly in particularly sensitive core periods, switching from night shoulder periods.

The DfT had considered limiting the quota period movements to recent actual levels. However it suggested that operators needed the scope to build up to current permitted levels to develop their business, which was considered a retrograde step as it would expose more people to night noise than at present and represent deterioration rather than improvement in the situation.

He said that the DfT had proposed a formal ban on scheduling QC4 aircraft at night, although not an absolute ban on operations. It had decided to retain the QC system as part of common arrangements across the three designated London airports, but it proposed to introduce a new QC 0.25 band to reduce the quota usage required for an airport to continue to operate at current

levels. He went onto explain the movement limits and noise quotas for Stansted, which were intended to be consistent with its specific night noise abatement objectives.

The DfT proposed that the noise insulation policy would initially be on a voluntary basis with the Government considering giving statutory backing if necessary. The 90dBA SEL footprint would determine properties eligible for insulation on the grounds of night noise.

He said that the Council had a declared policy seeking the phasing out of all air transport movements during the night time period except for emergencies, and this should be restated when responding to this Consultation. He said that the deadline for the response was 16 September 2005 and a draft would be circulated to Members for their comments and the final report would be taken to the Environment Committee.

Councillors expressed deep concern with the issue of night noise and that within the document there was only one-paragraph mentioning night noise restrictions. They expressed the need to stress the effects of the noise on the 1000's of people in the community who were suffering as a result of the few people who flew at night. They said it was a question of numbers versus noise.

SA5

ISSUES FOR THE NEXT MEETING OF STACC

The Chairman informed the Panel that the next meeting of STACC would be on Wednesday 27 2005 at 14:15. He explained that the main item would be a presentation on the draft interim master plan consultation.

Members asked the Chairman if he would raise again the issue of BAA not responding adequately to the DfT's requirement set out in the Air Transport white paper for a full master plan.

SA6

AUDIT OF FLIGHT EVALUATION UNIT - STANSTED AIRPORT

The Principal Environmental Health Officer informed the Panel that he had carried out an audit of the Flight Evaluation Unit (FEU) at Stansted Airport, which focused on community noise complaints, track keeping, engine testing, other ground noise, night flights, departure and arrival noise and public information. He then briefly went through each area and would circulate a copy of the report to Members for their information.

He said that all the complaints were found to have received proper consideration and responses had been made in accordance with the FEU's procedures. He added that a few members of the public were abusing the noise complaints service with one person who regularly made 100's of calls each month. He recommended that BAA Stansted could purchase new software to enable community complaint data to be reported in a more flexible way.

He then explained that BAA Stansted in December 2002 had introduced a process for surcharging aircraft operators who had failed to operate in

accordance with the noise preferential routes. The FEU used a monitoring system, which automatically detected occasions where aircraft flew outside the swathes when below the vectoring height. This information was used to comply the league tables and was reported by the FEU to the Noise and Track Keeping Working Party. He said that representation had been made to the CAA to include the information in future editions of the UK IAP. However this had not been adopted by the CAA and he recommended that Uttlesford District Council, Stansted Airport, and other Stansted Airport based organisations should continue to press the CAA to include the position of the swathes.

The second noise pen had been installed and no engine runs would be permitted on the compass base without specific written instructions of the Operations Duty Manager. He added that further restrictions had been placed on the use of Auxiliary Power Units (APUs) and Ground Power Units (GPUs) and recommended that BAA Stansted should carry out day time as well as night time audits of the use of fixed electrical GPU's.

He explained the controls of the operation of aircraft at night and that there were reductions in the departure noise limits for the night quota period and the shoulder periods either side of the time core period, which were set by the Department of Transport. However he said that the controls were under review with a new regime due by October 2005.

He also recommended that BAA Stansted should carry out noise readings under the arrivals path to assess the benefits that had occurred from using a continuous decent approach combined with the low power and low drag.

Members informed Officers that they were still receiving complaints from local residents regarding the noise from engine testing.

SA 7

DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND ITEMS FOR REPORTS

The Chairman informed the Panel that the next meeting would focus on a presentation from BAA on its interim master plan and pre-planning application studies of environmental effects giving Members the opportunity to ask them any questions.

Members confirmed that they wished the Panel to continue to operate on its current basis and not to meet in public.

The meeting ended at 9:10pm