

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES  
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.00pm on 28 JANUARY 2014**

Present: Councillors J Cheetham (Chairman), K Artus, A Dean,  
K Mackman and J Rose

Officers Present:

R Harborough (Director of Public Services), J Pine (Planning  
Policy/ DM Liaison Officer), A Rees (Democratic Services  
Support Officer) and A Taylor (Assistant Director - Planning  
and Building Control)

**SAP14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies were received from Councillors Lemon, Perry and Rich.

*Councillor Cheetham declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of  
NWEHPA.*

**SAP15 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29 OCTOBER 2013**

The minutes were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

**SAP16 MATTERS ARISING**

Councillor Artus said, referring to SAP11 paragraph 2, that it was unlikely that MAG would provide a copy of the Noise Action Plan to the Council until it was published. He also said that it should include alternative noise metrics.

Councillor Cheetham said that the Airports Commission's report highlighted the need for using multiple noise metrics when carrying out the Phase 2 shortlist assessments. This was encouraging.

Councillor Artus queried how effective the noise metrics would be as an assessment tool. It might end up being the responsibility of councils to progress this work in the absence of national guidance.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that there had to be a combination of noise metrics used.

Councillor Artus said that the Airports Commission referred in the interim report to looking at whether there was a case for lifting the existing passenger throughput and movement restrictions at Stansted. The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said he would be referring to this later in the meeting.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether all planning applications for airport development were classed as major infrastructure projects. The Planning

Policy / DM Liaison Officer explained it would depend upon the amount of extra throughput being proposed. Commonly, an extra 10mppa was assessed as a major infrastructure project which would be dealt with by the Major Infrastructure Planning Unit of the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Minister. Applications proposing less than an extra 10mppa (such as the recent application at Luton) would remain with the local planning authority.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether there were provisions to comment on the Airport Commission's interim report.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that there was currently no process for commenting on the report. He said he had sent an e-mail about the procedure that the Airports Commission would follow in looking at the case for the lifting of the planning restrictions at Stansted, but the response did not answer the questions he had raised. He would forward a copy of the email from the Commission Secretariat to Councillor Cheetham.

Councillor Dean referred to SAP12 paragraph 3 and said that the reduction in rail travel time was not the main issue. The focus should be on any increase in capacity.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that WARG's aim was a more reliable rail service by ensuring that travel times were consistent rather than journeys necessarily being quicker.

Councillor Cheetham said that she was concerned by the reduction in train services to Stansted. The National Infrastructure Plan 2013 had confirmed that a rail study would be carried out, in answer to one of the Airports Commission's short-term surface transport recommendations.

SAP17

#### **DFT: NIGHT FLYING RESTRICTIONS AT HEATHROW, GATWICK AND STANSTED, STAGE 2 CONSULTATION**

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that in April last year the Council had responded to a Stage One Consultation, which primarily looked at the scope of the proposed new restrictions. The current consultation was about the new restrictions which the Government was proposing to introduce, which would roll forward the existing restrictions until October 2017, with only minor modifications. The Government considered it sensible to not make any significant changes to the restrictions at this time pending receipt of the Airports Commission's final report and consideration by the next Government. Rolling forward the restrictions allowed for a business as usual approach, with only a high growth scenario impacting on the summer movement limit in 2016 – 2017. Even in that instance, the existing carry-over arrangements could be invoked by the airport operator to deal with any exceedances. The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that the Government proposed to extend the operational ban on QC8/16 aircraft to the late evening shoulder period. This represented only a minor benefit for local residents because of the very few flights that would be affected. The Government had proposed four environmental objectives for Stansted highlighted in paragraph 23 of the report. The Government supported trialling

of steeper approaches, but did not see the benefits of night-time runway preference schemes or displaced landing thresholds. The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said he was disappointed that the Government did not want to trial a respite period between 2am and 6am even though there had been other trials of respite periods. This was something that the Council should continue to ask for.

Councillor Artus said the momentum for reducing the number of night flights would be lost if the existing movement and quota limits were rolled forward. He said that Ryanair was looking to increase potential for long haul flights, which could involve more night flying. The Planning Policy / DM Liaison Officer referred to the draft reply to Question 6, which dealt with this point.

Councillor Cheetham said that despite pressing, it was possible that the Council would not get anywhere. She said because expansion of Stansted airport seemed unlikely beyond a single runway, which might be why Ryanair was looking at increasing its potential for long haul flights.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that the Manchester Airports Group (MAG) was looking at increasing long haul from Stansted as part of its business plan to 35mppa.

Councillor Dean said that the last sentence of the answer to Question 1 suggested that people moved around too much. He asked for an explanation of what was meant by the answer.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said he recalled that evidence presented at the Generation 1 planning inquiry had suggested that in a ten to fifteen year period around 30-40% of the population surrounding an airport may move away. This made it difficult to conduct health studies because, after establishing a base case, the sample size for later comparator studies was continually being reduced, limiting the statistical significance of the results.

Councillor Cheetham raised the issue of night time flights causing sleep deprivation.

Councillor Dean suggested following up on those who had moved. He said that sleep deprivation lowered people's ability to work effectively (especially those on night shifts) and should be considered a serious issue.

Councillor Artus said that a solution should be found to rectify this. He asked what time during the sleep cycle was considered the worst to be interrupted. He said he thought it was prior to entering deep sleep, i.e. quite early on in the sleep cycle.

Councillor Cheetham suggested that a new methodology be developed to better examine health issues. Sleep deprivation was causing an increasing amount of problems. She believed 4am to be the worst time to have sleep patterns interrupted.

The Director of Public Services said that the results had to look at long term exposure to living in proximity to an airport.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that he would highlight the Panel's concerns in his response by amending the replies to Questions 1, 6 and 11.

It was AGREED that the response as amended be sent to the DfT by way of a letter signed by Councillor Cheetham.

SAP18

### **OXFORD ECONOMICS: ECONOMIC IMPACT OF STANSTED SCENARIOS (OCTOBER 2013)**

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that at the last meeting it was agreed that officers would provide a summary of the Oxford Economics report. The Oxford Economics report had been commissioned by the London Stansted Cambridge Consortium (LSCC) and submitted to the Airports Commission for consideration as part of its Phase 1 work. The Oxford Economics report set out the economic benefits of four scenarios at Stansted, which were the 35mppa base case and three growth scenarios. The officers' report included the Airports Commission's comments on the growth scenarios. He said regarding scenario two (maximum use of the existing runway) the Commission would be looking at whether there was a case for lifting planning restrictions at Stansted airport. Regarding scenario three, the Commission had not shortlisted a second runway at Stansted, but this could be reconsidered after 2040/ 2050 if there was a case for a second net additional runway in the southeast at that time. With scenario four, the Commission had not shortlisted a hub airport at Stansted for a number of reasons. Looking at these reasons, there were a number that would probably also militate against the Isle of Grain option eventually being shortlisted. He said that the Oxford Economics report looked at tourism and said that increased passenger numbers on European flights could be dominated by outbound UK tourists.

Councillor Artus raised concerns about a post-35mppa expansion plan being mooted that the Council would have difficulty in refusing.

Councillor Rose asked if having 45mppa off the single runway was possible.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that it was possible.

Councillor Cheetham said that the infrastructure surrounding the airport would have to be improved to deal with the increase in passenger numbers.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that the existing planning restrictions on passenger throughput and air transport movements were so that the environmental effects of the airport would not exceed those modelled in the environmental impact assessment. These restrictions had been accepted by the inquiry inspector and, ultimately, the Secretary of State

when granting the planning permission. Any planning application for increased throughput would require fresh impact assessments to be carried out.

Councillor Artus said he had raised the issue of the resilience of the airport before. The maximum level of capacity that would be applied for in any new planning application would need to build resilience into it.

Councillor Cheetham said that filling up planes should be encouraged as a means of increasing passenger numbers. She said that it seemed that Sir Howard Davies was sceptical of hub airports and wanted to see a variety of airports expanded.

Councillor Dean said that the claim in the LSCC's covering letter that Stansted was crucial to international connectivity was wrong. He said that the covering letter undermined itself and asked what Essex County Council's position was.

Councillor Artus said that if there were demand for more long haul flights at Stansted airport there would already be more long haul flights.

Councillor Cheetham said that the County Council viewed Stansted as an economic driver. She reiterated her desire for a transport package to be part of any expansion.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said the Council was a member of the LSCC. He said that most of the work the LSCC does was through task and working groups and that the Council did not have control over the contents of the letter. The letter was signed by those who funded the report, which was why the report and letter differed in content. The LSCC position was to not hold a position on aviation expansion. He said Enfield Council was pro-growth and supportive of greater airport capacity.

Councillor Dean said that the Council should say that the covering letter had gone beyond its brief.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said that the Oxford Economics report was based purely on economics.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that the earlier drafts of the Oxford Economics report had exaggerated potential growth at the airport. This was likely due to misreading of the figures that BAA had provided for its Generation 1 and 2 expansion proposals.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Control said that any growth strategy would focus on business parks connected to the airport by rail.

Councillor Artus said that the issue went back to the County Council's focus on the first runway. He said there could be no reasons to disagree with expansion subject to appropriate improvements to infrastructure.

Councillor Cheetham said that in 2030 options would have to be looked at again. She also said that Essex, Hertfordshire and East Herts Councils had to look at what their positions would be on fully utilising the existing runway.

Councillor Dean noted that there was a danger of the decision making structure becoming difficult to understand.

Councillor Artus said that a statement should be made about the letter disagreeing with the report.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said that a statement had been made in the press release issued by the Council.

Councillor Rose asked whether Kevin Bentley had been looking at potential business support for a hub airport.

Councillor Cheetham asked if everybody could receive a copy of the statement. She said that the proposal of a hub airport on the Isle of Grain would never be possible due to European Union legislation relating to the protection of birds.

The Panel noted the report.

SAP19

#### **SHORT TERM SURFACE TRANSPORT MEASURES RECOMMENDED BY THE AIRPORTS COMMISSION**

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that the report was about four Stansted surface access recommendations which the Airports Commission had made in a letter to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The letter was attached to the report. The Government had confirmed in the National Infrastructure Plan that the recommendations would be taken forward. He said, in relation to recommendation six, that he had been invited by Network Rail to the first meeting of the Anglia Route Study Regional Group. This would provide an opportunity to brief stakeholders on the study and provide input. He would ask that the study looked at all benefits for passengers, as well as resilience issues.

In relation to recommendation nine, Councillor Cheetham said that there was pressure on road junctions at Braintree and that improving the infrastructure on roads would have to be looked at.

Councillor Dean asked why the previous Stansted to Stratford hourly service now started at Bishop's Stortford, and whether a second tunnel would be built to accommodate extra rail infrastructure.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that the service now started at Bishop's Stortford for timetabling and resilience reasons (the service now ran half-hourly). A second rail tunnel would only be built if there was a second runway at Stansted. In the meantime, MAG would make the argument that any increase in passenger numbers could be accommodated via longer trains.

The Director of Public Services said that improving infrastructure would drive demand for increased capacity at Stansted.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said that MAG looked at the issue of capacity differently to the Airports Commission. In Manchester 15% of passengers arrived via public transport. At Stansted the figure was 50%. He said that it was likely that MAG would develop an understanding of this difference.

Councillor Artus said that Airports Commission report did not look at who was paying for any improvements in infrastructure. He suggested that public transport was not as well connected moving northward and said that not all growth should come from London.

Councillor Cheetham said that having four platforms at Broxbourne was being looked at, but that any proposal for having four platforms at Tottenham Hale did not make sense because it was unclear how it could be expanded.

Councillor Rose asked how businesses perceived this issue, because Stansted had some of the fastest connections to London.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that MAG did not see Stansted as being just “London Stansted” (unlike BAA), rather as a regional airport which could have its own market for long-haul. Accordingly, efforts would be made to improve northbound public transport, particularly to / from Cambridge where there was currently a high incidence of “kiss and fly” car movements. He said that whilst in some respects rail connections from Stansted to London were very good, there were areas where they were not as good as they could be, particularly in relation to the lack of three or four-tracking. He said that Network Rail felt that it would be possible to have four platforms at Tottenham Hale, but expensive bridge works would be involved.

The Panel noted the letter.

SAP20

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Councillor Artus asked what had happened to the updates on Section 106 agreements and whether in future meetings updates could appear on the agenda again. The Planning Policy / DM Liaison Officer said that he would prepare a report for the next Panel meeting. It was likely that little had changed since the last report because the airport had not been growing.

Councillor Rose asked about the relaxation of planning restrictions at the Airport and how this would conflict with the Council's policy.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said that establishing whether Council policy conflicted with relaxed conditions was important.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether the airport should be asked to attend the next meeting.

Councillor Artus said that there had to be a reason for asking them to attend and if someone was invited to attend it should tie in with phase two of the consultation.

Councillor Rose asked whether Network Rail should be asked to attend the next meeting.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that he would invite Network Rail to the next meeting.

SAP21

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

A date during the second half of April was agreed, subject to when Network Rail would be able to attend.

The meeting ended at 8.15pm.