

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.30 pm on 22 OCTOBER 2007**

Present:- Councillor K R Artus – Chairman.
Councillors E L Bellingham-Smith, C A Cant, J F Cheetham,
E Godwin, D M Jones, R M Lemon, G Sell, L A Wells and
P A Wilcock.

Also present:- Councillor A J Ketteridge.

Officers in attendance:- R Harborough, J Mitchell and P Snow.

SAP18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

An apology for absence was received from Councillor A Dean.

Councillor J F Cheetham declared a personal interest as a member of SSE and NWEHPA, the National Trust and Hatfield Forest Management Committee.

Councillor Bellingham-Smith declared a personal interest as a member of the National Trust.

Councillor R M Lemon declared a personal interest as a member of the National Trust and Hatfield Heath Parish Council.

SAP19 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2007 were agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

The Chairman requested that relevant lists of actions and current consultations be appended to the front and back of the Minutes respectively.

(i) Minute SAP14 (ii) - G2 Proposals

The Director of Development advised Members that a formal report on resources for the G2 inquiry was not yet available.

(ii) Minute SAP14 (iii) – G2 Inquiry

Reference was made to the request to the Finance and Administration Committee to authorise expenditure of £240 for the display of banners on recycling vehicles. This request had not yet been formally considered, but officers were likely to advise against this course of action.

It was understood that the intention was to run down existing stocks of paper with the “no to more runways at Stansted” strap line because of the pending G2 application.

The Leader said that the Council had sustained a four or five year period of consistent opposition to a second runway and he did not understand why a change of policy was needed now.

Councillor Lemon proposed that the Advisory Panel pursue the request made at the previous meeting and that the strap line be continued on all relevant stationery.

Councillor Jones did not agree with this approach and said that the Council should not put itself in the position of being seen to deal with the G2 application in a prejudicial way.

The majority of Members supported the proposal and requested the Chief Executive either to attend a meeting of the Advisory Panel to explain why it could not be done or to send an e-mail to all Members setting out the position in clear terms.

- ACTION:**
- 1 The request to the Finance and Administration Committee to finance the display of banners on the recycling fleet be pursued.
 - 2 The Chief Executive be requested to continue the "Uttlesford says no" message on all relevant stationery and to clearly explain the position to Members if he considered that neither course of action should be undertaken.

SAP20

UPDATE ON G1 INQUIRY

The Head of Planning and Housing Strategy reported on the application by BAA for an award of partial costs against the Council and Essex and Hertfordshire County Councils on the following four grounds:-

- 1 Bias in determining the application on the grounds of the previous membership of SSE by some Members of the Development Control Committee, and the participation of Members who had resumed their SSE membership in the decision of the Development Control Committee on 5 September 2007.
- 2 That very little weight had been given to national policy as set out in the Air Transport White Paper.
- 3 The Council had failed to discuss mitigation in advance of the determination of the application.
- 4 The Council had failed to substantiate the reasons for refusal.

He said that the Council would vigorously rebut the costs application. The Council had taken into account advice in the Government circular on award of costs in preparing the Development Control Committee report in November 2006, evidence to the Public Inquiry and correspondence. It was strongly felt that the Council had a proper response to the costs application which would

be determined by the Secretary of State separately from determination of the Planning Appeal itself.

The Council had two weeks to respond to the application for costs following which BAA had two weeks to comment on that response before it was considered by the Secretary of State. The Director of Development said he was confident that the Council had fully defended its reasons for refusal of the G1 application on planning grounds and the matter would be pursued accordingly.

Councillor Sell asked about the extent of support from neighbouring authorities.

That part of the claim made against Essex and Herts County Councils, related to the surface access evidence only and, if the claim were to succeed, the major share would therefore fall upon the District Council.

Councillor Lemon said that this had been a very stressful experience for all involved and thanked all of the officers, including Jeremy Pine, for their efforts. Councillor Cheetham said that the Members of the Development Control Committee had tried their utmost to be fair throughout the application process. The Director of Development said that the feelings of Members would be conveyed to the Council's legal representative in an appropriate manner.

ACTION: The Director of Development be asked to report on resource implications arising from the G1 Inquiry in the light of the claim for costs, and the likelihood of contributions being forthcoming from other authorities.

SAP21

UPDATE ON G2 PROPOSALS

The Head of Planning and Housing Strategy advised Members it was possible the G2 application would not be submitted until February 2008. Preliminary discussions had taken place with the Government Office for the East of England and the Planning Inspectorate regarding the process to be adopted when the application was submitted. Go East would not confirm whether the application would be called in or, if so, when. It appeared that Uttlesford was expected to at least begin the process of considering the application. It was possible, that a public inquiry could take place as early as October next year. Under new inquiry rules for major infrastructure projects it was possible that such an inquiry could include concurrent sessions.

The Director of Development commented that this could have cost implications. It was possible that a further Stansted Inquiry could be the first main application to be considered under the new rules. The Planning Inspectorate was keen to ensure that the inquiry system could handle major national projects effectively under the new rules. It was not expected that the proposals would be determined by the proposed infrastructure planning commission. That would first require primary legislation.

If the Secretary of State decided to take the application out of the District Council's hands, a public inquiry would be arranged. The Council would then have to form a view upon the application. It was likely that, by this time, all of the District Character Reserve would have been expended. Beyond that there was no further budgetary provision and the only new income would be from the planning application fee for the G2 application. Finally, Members asked about the scope for contributions from other authorities. The Head of Planning and Housing Strategy said that this was under discussion, based on an analysis of costs that had been incurred in relation to G1, and potential costs dependent on the approach to G2.

A further report would be brought before Members in due course.

SAP22 **DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT CONSULTATION ON THE EMISSIONS COST ASSESSMENT**

The Head of Planning and Housing Strategy circulated a draft of the SASIG response to the Department for Transport Consultation on the Emissions Cost Assessment. Officers would discuss possible changes with SASIG and also submit the Council's comments to DfT. The ECA should be formulated in a way that enabled it to be used by local planning authorities in considering individual airport development proposals, as stated in the Air Transport White Paper Progress Report.

SAP23 **HIGHWAYS AGENCY – AIRPORT ACCESS FROM M11 AND A120**

A report was submitted about the further consultation exercise being undertaken by the Highways Agency following the Spring 2007 consultation on plans for future improvements to the road access into an expanded Stansted Airport. This involved the provision of new junctions on the M11 and A120.

The Head of Planning and Housing Strategy stated that the re-consultation acknowledged that, in addition to the one preferred option, there were two alternative viable options. These had now been distinguished from a number of discounted options. In the light of that acknowledgement, consultees were being asked if they had any further observations to make.

A number of Members expressed grave concerns about the effect of the proposed road access improvements, particularly on the communities of Birchanger and Burton End. There was a further concern that too much land would be allocated for these improvements and that it would involve the provision of two major junctions within very close proximity.

A response had been sent on behalf of the Council at the time of the initial consultation and the Highways Agency had been advised that the Council would need to know more about the nature of the proposals before it was possible to comment.

A further concern was expressed that the Highways Agency's plans reflected proposals prepared, in the first instance, by BAA.

The deadline for the submission of a response to this consultation was 5 November. It was agreed that a response would be circulated to Members before submission. This would express concerns about the impact on communities and landscape.

ACTION: Officers prepare a submission to the Highways Agency on the lines set out in this Minute.

SAP24

STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING ON 31 OCTOBER 2007

Councillor Wilcock said that there had been problems with the collection of fines imposed on airlines for the failure to meet key track keeping targets and explained the reasons why these problems had occurred. The sums concerned were not considered to be a high priority by BAA. The responsibility for collecting them was left with the central BAA office in Glasgow. As a result, BAA did not appreciate the sensitivity and importance of this matter for the local community. He said that progress in this direction was now being made, but that further improvements were needed.

Councillor Cheetham suggested that a question about the collection of fines should be raised at the Consultative Committee meeting on 31 October.

Councillor Wilcock confirmed that no fines had been imposed this year in respect of breaches of noise targets.

SAP25

OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

Councillor Jones referred to the monitoring of air noise conducted in eight schools, as reported in Minute SAP15 of the last meeting, and declared a personal interest as a Governor of Takeley school.

Councillor Cant pointed out that part of BAA's final submissions to the G1 inquiry stated that no schools would be affected by noise.

The Head of Planning and Housing Strategy confirmed that concerns about health impact assessment methodology topics had been raised at the G2 health topic working group, but that no change in approach was likely to result.

SAP26

SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

It was noted that the meeting scheduled to take place on Monday 24 March should be changed as that day was Easter Monday.

DECISION: That the date of the meeting scheduled for Monday 24 March be changed to Tuesday 25 March.

The meeting ended at 9.05 pm. Page 5