

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.30pm on 12 DECEMBER 2005**

Present: Councillor P A Wilcock – Chairman.
Councillors K R Artus, C A Cant, A Dean, C Down, S Flack, M L
Foley, E J Godwin, R T Harris, R M Lemon, A R Row, M J
Savage, G Sell and A R Thawley.

Also present: - Alastair McDermid BAA Stansted G2 Project Director.

Officers in attendance: A Bovaird, W Cockerill, R Harborough, V M
Harvey, J Mitchell and J Pine.

SA22

**PRESENTATION FROM BAA ON ITS SECOND RUNWAY OPTIONS
CONSULTATION**

Alastair McDermid, BAA's G2 Project Director, presented the G2 Consultation document to the Panel. He gave an overview of the document and encouraged Members to ask questions if they were unclear on any point.

Page 6 set out the consultation timetable (9 December 2005 – 24 March 2006). BAA expected many responses during the consultation period and the position of the runway was not yet agreed upon.

Page 10 short-listed the seven different two-runway layout options. On the plans the solid colour identified the growth in phase one and the hashed colour identified growth at a later phase. Phase 1 would involve adding about 15mppa capacity off the new runway.

Option A (Plan 3) was BAA's preferred runway scheme; an eastern central parallel runway option in mixed mode. The runways would be 2274m apart, measured from centreline to centreline. Mixed mode is using both runways for incoming and outgoing flights, resulting in higher capacity – 76mppa by 2030. Segregated mode is using one runway for outgoing flights and the other for incoming, but resulting in lower capacity (Plan 4 – 63mppa by 2030).

Plan 8 (Option B) was BAA's version of the wide spaced runway option set out in the Government White Paper. The runways would be 2450 metres apart. This option would see the new terminal building back to back with the existing one. Assuming the runways operated in mixed mode, this would also see 76 million passengers using the airport by 2030.

Plan 9 would have the same layout as Plan 8, but would be operated in segregated mode, resulting in a capacity of 63 mppa by 2030.

Plan 13 (Option C) featured a wide spaced runway but with the separation reduced to 1800m. This would mean the new terminal could not be positioned back to back or at right angles with the existing terminal, it would have to go to the north. Operating in mixed mode, the capacity would again be 76mppa.

Plan 14 was Option C in segregated mode, again resulting in a capacity of 63mppa.

Plan 18 (Option D) showed the new runway north west of the existing runway. This could only be operated in segregated mode, as the runways would be close and parallel. Councillor Thawley asked how close the runways were permitted to be in the UK, as in America runways could be very close together. Alastair McDermid said that under British Civil Aviation Authority regulations runways could be no closer than 477.5 m apart. This was because of poorer visibility in prevailing British weather conditions. Capacity again would be 63mppa.

Councillor Lemon asked why BAA were putting forward a series of options when they had already decided upon Option A. Alastair McDermid said that this was not true. BAA had an open mind and genuinely wanted to know what residents and UDC thought of the options and the reasons for preferring one option over another. If another option was strongly favoured, then BAA would consider it.

Councillor Flack asked why the document did not show the flight paths. She said the public could not make a fair decision without knowing which areas would be under flight paths. Alastair McDermid said that BAA did not yet know what the flight paths would be, so could not include them in the consultation document. Flight paths were set by the Civil Aviation Authority. Councillor Thawley drew attention to Plan 11 and criticised the omission of lower LAeq contours below 57dB. He thought it had been agreed that the 54 dB contour should be shown as a sensitivity test to using 54 or lower. He queried the assumptions about noise preferential routes that must underlie the noise contours. It was confirmed that BAA had assumed no alterations to the existing pattern of routes for noise modelling purposes

Alastair McDermid then continued to go through the document. Page 16 identified what the document was not about. Councillor Dean drew attention to the issue of green house gas emissions from aviation, stating that the contribution to climate change from the additional movements would be very high. BAA would need to identify these effects in its subsequent planning application.

Page 19 drew attention to the five criteria used by BAA to help the technical evaluation of the master plan options. The option was set against economics, environmental performance, flexibility, operational performance and passenger experience.

Pages 21 and 22 described the consideration given to aircraft design and runway length. For airport design purposes aircraft would fall into different size categories. At present BAA could not be certain which size aircraft would be in operation, however the land allocated for the taxiways would be made big enough to take the largest aircraft with 80 metre wingspan. The new runway would preferably be the same length as the existing one for maximum flexibility in operation

Pages 36 and 37 explained the preferred option against the environmental and economic factors and to see if the mixed or segregated mode performed better. A mixed mode would be 20 – 25% cheaper than segregated mode in terms of capital cost per passenger. The capital costs of £2.7 billion would

enable an additional 40 mppa throughput. Option A in segregated mode would be £430 million less, but enable 28 mppa.

Councillor Godwin asked if the improvements to transport links would be required. She noted that a lot of parking was proposed. She stated that it would be better to have less parking and greater use of public transport. Alastair McDermid explained that the costing had taken into account provision for increasing the sizes of the rail station and the bus / coach station. He said that if there was not enough car parking, this would encourage drop offs and pick-ups, thus resulting in four car journeys opposed to only two.

Councillor Cant said that in Uttlesford the community prided itself on the countryside. All options involved significant land take. She also commented that it seemed that the second terminal was going to be mainly used by “No Frills” airlines, which would entail walking onto the tarmac. A lot of elderly and disabled people in the area use, and would continue to use the airport. Would there be adequate provision for these people? Alastair McDermid confirmed that the costings assumed the same quality of facilities as at the present one. He also felt that the new proposals would fit into the countryside setting.

Councillor Foley said that UDC had called for a ban on night flights and asked why this was not mentioned in the consultation. Alastair McDermid replied by saying that the night flight regime was a matter for the Department of Transport and not BAA. Councillor Wilcock reminded the Panel that UDC had made representations to the Government on night noise.

Councillor Harris had concerns that the implementation of such a significant construction project was beyond the resources of BAA as a public company. He asked if it could be possible that the second runway and terminal would not be fully completed or used to capacity. Alastair McDermid said that this was a decision for the BAA Board. It had decided to progress the preparation of proposals.

BAA having concluded its presentation, the public were then asked to leave for the remainder of the meeting.

BAA was asked about any further plans for development beyond 2030. It confirmed that it had no present proposals.

Many Councillors voiced concern over additional areas being blighted by the range of options now published, which would result in residents being unable to sell properties. They asked if more properties could be included within the scope of the Home Ownership Support Scheme and Home Value Guarantee Schemes. Alastair McDermid said that consideration had been given to this, but he would take this item back to BAA for discussion. Councillor Wilcock suggested that the Panel write to BAA asking for reconsideration of this. The Panel agreed.

BAA was asked about its method for assessing demand and whether the big carriers would be attracted to use Stansted if a second runway was provided. Alastair McDermid said that BAA forecast demand using the relationship with economic growth and judgements about the interplay between airports and passenger choice. It did not assess demand on the basis of airline

aspirations. Airlines would want to be positioned where the demand lies. By 2030 an expected 300million passengers would use South East airports each year.

Members were asked to note the consultation document and to analyse the proposed plans. Appropriate arrangements would be made to enable the Council's response to the consultation within the period requested by BAA. It was recognised that the calendar for Council meetings did not fit well with BAA's timetable.

SA23 **APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies were received from Councillor Cheetham and Councillor Wattebot.

There were no declarations of interest received.

SA24 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held 24 October were received and signed as a correct record.

SA13 - Presentation by SSE of its views on BAA's draft Interim Master Plan & SA 17 Stansted Airport Interim Master Plan response to consultation

Councillor Dean informed the Panel that he had re-written parts of its recommendations to the Council. He had added more detail and tightened up the wording. Councillor Wilcock said the Panel would note the proposal subject to Officers advice.

SA25 **MATTERS ARISING**

Councillor Godwin informed the Panel that she had spoken with Carol Barbone who wished to meet with UDC to discuss the second runway at Stansted Airport. The Chief Executive said SSE were welcome to attend a further meeting but it would not be appropriate to share the meeting with BAA.

The meeting ended at 10.00pm