

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL meeting held at  
COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at  
7.30 pm on 11 SEPTEMBER 2008**

**PRESENTATION BY BAA**

The Chairman welcomed Roger Pellman, Tim Norwood and John Penniket from BAA, who would give a presentation, which would then be followed by the Panel meeting. He asked that all should stand for a few moments' silence in recognition of the events which took place at the World Trade Centre on this date seven years ago.

A copy of the presentation would be made available on request to Officers.

Members' questions arising from the presentation raised the following topics:

- methodology for calculating flight demand forecasts for the South East;
- provision within the application for a change from segregated to mixed mode;
- whether an additional railway track would be planned on the West Anglia Main Line;
- light pollution from surface car parks;
- measures to protect wildlife (in particular, bats);
- cargo forecasts;
- the implications of the expected economic impact report from the DfT;
- the impact of a general election;
- implications of a Competition Commission report;
- the concept of an 'airport in the countryside';
- categories of jobs forming the 13,600 new jobs which were forecast;
- consultation with local businesses regarding pressure in the local labour market;
- blight extending to areas where no compensation had been planned;
- World Health Organisation lower Leq noise assessment requirements.

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL MEETING**

Present:- Councillor D M Jones – Chairman.  
Councillors K R Artus, J F Cheetham, E J Godwin, R M Lemon, G Sell, D G Perry and P A Wilcock.

Also present:- Councillor J Hudson  
Officers  
in attendance:- W Cockerell (Principal Environmental Health Officer), R Harborough (Acting Director of Development), J Pine (Planning Policy and Development Control Liaison Officer) and R Procter (Democratic Services Officer).

**SAP5 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C A Cant and A Dean.

*Councillor Cheetham declared a personal interest as a member of SSE, the National Trust, and NWEHPA.*

*Councillor Godwin declared a personal interest as a member of SSE.*

*Councillor Lemon declared a personal interest as a member of the National Trust.*

**SAP6 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2008 were agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the following amendments to SAP4:

In the penultimate paragraph, to substitute for the phrase 'so far approximately 450 representations had been received from Town and Parish Councils' the following wording: 'so far approximately 450 representations had been received in total, of which 23 were from Town or Parish Councils.'

**SAP7 MATTERS ARISING**

**(i) Minute SAP2 – NATS consultation**

The Acting Director of Development said that NATS had published an initial feedback report on its website, and would issue further updates. With direct relevance to Uttlesford, further design options were being considered to take into account representations which had been made.

**(ii) Minute SAP2 – G2 Inquiry**

The Panel were informed that publicity materials had now been produced, and a poster of Members' signatures confirming opposition to the airport expansion was now on display in the reception area of the offices. Councillor Cheetham said it was a pity that banners had not been put up for this evening's presentation.

The Acting Director of Development said that there had also been further publicity via the CO2 group. Joint press releases on behalf of the ten authorities signed up to the campaign were now being issued.

SAP8

### **STANSTED GENERATION 1 AND 2 PROGRESS REPORT**

The Planning Policy and Development Control Liaison Officer presented a report updating the Panel on the impending decision on Stansted Generation 1 (SG1) following the Inquiry last year, and reported on progress with preparations for the SG2 Inquiry due to start in 2009.

Regarding SG1, Councillor Cheetham referred to additional representations in connection with a proposed condition on planning permission. She had heard that these representations were being made by organisations which had not attended the Inquiry. Officers replied that additional representations had been received expressing opposition to the proposed condition, the purpose of which would be to permit some control over air noise in the night shoulder periods. It was counsel's view that as these representations had not been tested by the Inquiry limited weight should be attached to them.  
(Councillor K R Artus joined the meeting.)

Councillor Sell asked if there was any feedback on the question of costs of the Inquiry. Jeremy Pine said that in his view the length of the Inquiry indicated that the Council's case had been supported by a substantial body of evidence. He would be extremely disappointed if the costs were to be awarded to BAA. Councillor Cheetham expressed concern that if such a precedent were to be set, no local authority would be willing to refuse planning permission for large-scale commercial developments. Councillor Godwin agreed such an outcome would have a deterrent effect.

Regarding SG2, the Panel was referred to the probable timetable and to the arrangements for inspectors, as set out in the report. In response to a question, Jeremy Pine confirmed that it was likely that the inspector would request that a transcript be made available to all parties.

The Panel considered the funding of the Inquiry and the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 section 250 (4), which meant that all parties could be potentially ordered to pay for an Inquiry. This could be on a pro rata basis. Members expressed concern at the implications for all small authorities facing similar proceedings.

The Panel considered the schedule of representations received so far, summarised at appendix two of the report. Jeremy Pine said that the schedule was updated daily, and that the number of letters of objection logged so far was currently 1,526 and the number of letters of support was 171. There were an additional 800 letters to be processed, and a significant spike in consultation responses was expected as the deadline of 26 September approached. In reply to a question from Councillor Sell, he said that the numbers received were in line with expectations. Responses opposing the proposals were being categorised according to the objections stated, such as noise, visual impact, blight, etc. Geographical analysis was possible to an extent, and showed clusters of objections or support from areas as far away as Nottingham.

Councillor Artus asked about the approach taken regarding block responses, and whether weighting was applied to representations from Town or Parish Councils. Jeremy Pine explained that each response was treated as an individual one, and that the main points were taken from each letter. Members raised several questions on pro forma letters and the way in which officers were dealing with duplicate letters. Jeremy Pine confirmed that they would be taken into account.

In reply to a question from Councillor Cheetham, officers confirmed that the Council would challenge BAA's forecasts for demand. In reply to a question from Councillor Wilcock, officers advised that the budget of £500,000 for 2008/09 had assumed an Inquiry start date of January 2009. However as the start of the Inquiry was now deferred until April 2009 most of the barristers' fees would not arise until 2009/10. Essex County Council would re-charge costs to the Council under the four authorities agreement.

In reply to a question from Councillor Sell regarding when charges would begin to be incurred, the Acting Director of Development said that liaison meetings of the four authorities, which were taking place regularly at Member level, would be receiving reports of expenditure to date and committed expenditure together with updated estimates

The Panel discussed the venue for the Inquiry, which was likely to be Endeavour House although it had been sold by BAA to new owners.

SAP9

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Acting Director of Development advised the Panel that a draft response to the forthcoming DEFRA consultation on guidance for producing noise action plans for airports would be brought before the next meeting. In the interim officers would feed comments into the Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group of the Local Government Association.

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm.