

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.30 pm on 24 JUNE 2009**

Present: Councillor D M Jones – Chairman.
Councillors K R Artus, C A Cant, J F Cheetham, E J
Godwin, R M Lemon, D G Perry and L A Wells.

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

SAP1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A Dean, G Sell and P
Wilcock.

*Councillors Artus and Cheetham declared personal interests as members of
Stansted Airport Consultative Committee (STACC), and Councillor Cheetham
declared a personal interest as a member of NWEHPA.*

SAP2 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2009 were agreed and signed
by the Chairman as a correct record.

SAP3 MATTERS ARISING

(i) Minute SAP17 – NATS consultation

The Acting Director of Development had sought a meeting with NATS
prior to its proposed further consultation, but had received no
response, and there had been no further developments.

(ii) Minute SAP19 – Flight Evaluation Unit

An audit had been carried out, which would be circulated to Members.
Councillors inquired whether the issue of multiple complaints via the
telephone complaints system had been resolved. Concern had
previously been expressed at a meeting of STACC that the inability to
complain about more than one incident at a time could deter people
from making complaints. Officers agreed to check this point.

*(Following the meeting it was confirmed that multiple complaints were
now possible.)*

SAP4 STANSTED AIRPORT G2 UPDATE

The report before Members, which set out the positions of the main parties on
when the G2 Inquiry should start, had now been superseded. Officers
circulated a letter received from John Denham MP, the new Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government. BAA had announced on 18 May its
intention to appeal to the Competition Appeals Tribunal (CAT) against the

Competition Commission's findings. Officers would monitor the appeal, which could take several months, via the CAT website.

The CAT had called a case conference for 1 July, when the competition appeal start date should be made known. Officers would keep Members informed of developments.

The CAT process was publicly accessible. It was noted that the Panel had previously considered whether it should make representations to the Commission, but had decided this was not in its remit.

Members were pleased to hear that proofs of evidence for the G2 inquiry on land based issues were now in a high state of readiness, on Counsel's advice. The implications of the delay on resourcing were discussed. Officers advised that the budget provided for expenditure this year, but that the delay meant the full amount would not be spent this year.

RECOMMENDED to Finance and Administration Committee that the provision in the budget for opposing Stansted Airport G2 be ring-fenced.

Officers would write to the Secretary of State objecting to the brevity of the period proposed for picking up the case after what was likely to be a year's delay. Further preparation as a result of the delay would impose additional costs. Some Members advised caution in making representations, as deferral was helpful to opposing G2. Legal advice would be taken on issues such as a claim for costs due to deferral of the Inquiry start date.

SAP5

STANSTED AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Panel considered a report on proposals recently suggested by the new Chairman of the Stansted Airport Consultative Committee (STACC) for wide-ranging changes to membership, structure, and terms of reference and operation of STACC. A consultative committee was required for every airport, and the chairmanship was a government appointment. The report gave details of the current terms of reference of the committee, and the proposals for change, and offered a summary of Officers' comments in response to the suggestions. Officers' perception was that certain working groups, including the Noise Track Keeping Working Group (NTKWG) and Passenger Service Group (PSG), were more effective than STACC at enabling Stansted Airport Ltd to engage with Airport users. However, there was merit in considering what changes to STACC might achieve improved performance. Officers would also welcome access to the NTKWG and its reports.

Councillor Cheetham said as the Council's representative on STACC since the early 1980s, she had asked for this item to be on tonight's agenda. Aside from the issue of expansion, STACC had always had an excellent relationship with the Airport. It was intended to be a consultative committee, although there had been some resistance to giving the public the opportunity to make statements. She was now concerned that the proposed terms of reference would be outside STACC's remit. She would be interested to hear the views of Councillor Artus, who had been appointed to the STACC working party

which was examining the proposals, and hoped he could take back the Panel's comments.

Councillor Artus said he had been invited to consider the proposals, in his capacity as representative for the Uttlesford Association of Local Councils. The proposals aimed to address various concerns about the credibility of STACC. The expansion issue, which was beyond STACC's remit, had on occasion detracted from discussion of airport operation. The value of STACC's consultative role had to be questioned, as BAA had refused to act on the small number of requests the committee had made. Resourcing of changes would need to be looked into. This was an opportunity to invite external bodies such as the Chamber of Commerce or Schipol to contribute expertise.

Members went on to discuss the proposals, and points were made as follows:

- Members were interested in receiving [STACC Minutes](#), which were no longer circulated – officers advised these were available on the website.
- Independent expertise would be beneficial and would provide a fresh impetus.
- STACC should arrange studies such as the effect of air noise on schools, as such exercises were costly for other bodies to carry out.
- Means of resourcing both external advisors and studies would need to be established.
- Committee members could be disadvantaged by imposing a maximum 4 year membership, as this would be likely to limit them in developing expertise and understanding of complex issues.
- Some Members felt there was no point in empire-building or setting up a quango with further sub committees, when other bodies such as the NTKWG accomplished practical aims. Without a clear role, it was perhaps time STACC came to an end.
- The working arrangements of the airport were what concerned people. STACC should focus on practical issues for those using the airport.
- Other Members disagreed with confining the remit of STACC in this way, as external presentations were helpful.
- STACC needed to be more relevant, and external presentations would help keep it from being stale.
- Concern was expressed about the suggested change in categories of subject matter to include environmental impacts. The original reference was to people – it was important to keep the focus on the local community.
- It would be helpful to invite representatives from organisations with a focus on people, such as the Tourism Board, and the Consumer Association.
- It was of concern that the only bodies with capacity and resources to send representatives were local authorities.
- Members were keen to receive Minutes of the NTKWG, and asked Officers to find out if these could be made available.
- It was noted that the Council was entitled to appoint a representative and a substitute to STACC. Councillor Cheetham and Councillor

Wilcock ensured they covered meetings between them, and proposals to strike off committee members who did not attend on several occasions needed to take into account the substitute system.

Members noted that the next meeting of STACC was due to take place on 22 July 2009. The following action was agreed.

ACTION:

- 1 Councillor Artus would circulate to STAAP Members the updated draft terms of reference.
- 2 Those Members who attended STACC would seek further information on the proposals at this stage to report back to STAAP.
- 3 The Lead Officer and Chairman of STAAP would write to Stewart Ashurst to set out the Panel's concerns.

SAP6

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Draft Noise Action Plan

It was noted the draft Noise Action Plan was now out for consultation. Officers would circulate to Members the link to the website. [Draft Noise Action Plan](#)

Officers sought Members' views on whether the Council wished to be associated with the consultation in terms of providing venues. Various suggestions were made for venues for the consultation events to be held. It was agreed that Station House in Takeley would be a useful venue, and that Town Councillors in Saffron Walden and Dunmow should be contacted. Officers would report further on the draft Action Plan at the next meeting.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm.