

STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL MEETING held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7pm on 3 SEPTEMBER 2014

Present: Councillor J Cheetham (Chairman)
Councillors A Dean, E Godwin, D Jones, M Lemon and J Rich.

Officers in attendance: R Harborough (Director of Public Services), J Pine (Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer) and A Rees (Democratic Services Support Officer).

Also present: Councillors C Cant, M Felton, E Hicks, J Menell, E Oliver and L Wells and Martin Peachey (Stansted Noise and Track Keeping Working Group).

SAP8 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Artus, Mackman Perry and Rose.

Councillor Cheetham declared non-pecuniary interests as a member of NWEENPHA and of the Hatfield Forest Management Committee.

Councillor Dean declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Stop Stansted Expansion.

SAP9 MINUTES

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

SAP10 MATTERS ARISING

Minute SAP3 – Airports Commission – Update

Since the last Panel meeting, the Council had responded to the Commission's latest discussion paper "Utilisation of the UK's Existing Airport Capacity" and to the Mayor's Crossrail 2 consultation.

SAP11 CONSULTATION ON NATS DEPARTURE ROUTE PROPOSAL AT STANSTED AIRPORT

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that this proposal, which was promoted by NATS and London Stansted Airport, aimed to switch most daytime traffic from the Dover Standard Instrument Departure (SID) to the Clacton SID. Night-time departures were not part of the consultation. Three reasons had been given by the sponsors of the proposal for making the change, they were; i) a reduction in the number of people regularly

overflown, ii) reduced delays for passengers and iii) reduced CO² emissions and fuel burn. The Planning Policy/DM Liaison Officer said NATS have pointed out that airlines may already choose to fly the Clacton SID in order to avoid London airspace. This proposal was part of Phase 1 of a wider programme of airspace modernisation known as the London Airspace Management Programme (LAMP). LAMP Phase 2 would be subject to a separate consultation at a later date, with implementation due in 2018/9.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer explained that 70% of aircraft took-off on Runway 22 and 30% on Runway 04. Departures from Runway 22 using the Dover SID currently climbed over Tilekiln Green, Great and Little Hallingbury and continued over Hatfield Heath. Those using the Clacton SID turned more sharply over Hatfield Heath. Runway 04 departures using the Clacton SID climbed over Broxted and began to straighten out over Great Easton. Runway 04 departures on the Dover SID turned very sharply south to the east of Broxted, passing to the west of Little Easton and Great Dunmow.

85% of flights on the Clacton SID were able to achieve continuous climb to 7,000ft, whilst this figure was only 10% on the Dover SID. The reason for this is the flights are held below 7,000ft until they reach South Essex / North Kent so that they do not conflict with Heathrow arrivals. At night the figures for continuous climb for the SIDs were comparable due to the lower number of Heathrow arrivals.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that there was no “win-win” situation for local residents. It was realistic to assume that the proposal would be implemented as it would relieve congestion in the London airspace. Evidence provided by NATS as part of the consultation showed that use of the Clacton SID (based on 2012 data) would increase from about 51 flights per day to 109 per day. The airport had planning permission that enabled its current throughput to double from 17.46 million passengers per annum (mppa) to 35mppa. It was realistic to expect the number of departures to double as well.

Population data provided by NATS showed that 1,470 fewer people living under the Dover SID would be regularly overflown, but there would be 2,400 people living under the Clacton SID who would experience more overflying. The Clacton SID also overflew Great Easton Primary School, which would experience double the current level of overflying on days when the school was open and Runway 04 was in use. Northbound flights were not part of the consultation and so the north of the district would be largely unaffected.

Residents who lived further away from the airport under the Dover SID (such as those in South Essex or North Kent) would experience less noise benefit from the switch to the Clacton SID as aircraft are higher in those locations. In terms of tangible benefits between 4,000ft – 7,000ft, the consultation document stated the main benefit would be reduced CO² emissions. The estimated saving would in reality be negligible and would amount to less than 1%.

In response to questions from the Panel, the Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said engine and airframe noise from turning planes was reflected downwards by the wings and so it could seem louder to residents who were not actually being overflown. As Hatfield Heath was at a point where the Dover and Clacton SIDs split, it should not be affected by a change of SID use. It was unclear exactly how the proposals would be affected by LAMP Phase 2.

Mr Peachey said he had been working with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). In his opinion, the noise impact of the proposal would be neutral. Any reduction in CO² emissions would be dependent on the traffic mix, as the savings on long haul flights would be less significant. NATS had recently had its best figure ever on delays and had implemented a new system which improved communication between its airports. This proposal only related to daytime flights, but night-time flight caused a disproportionate number of complaints. If there was continuous descent on the Runway 04 approach, noise levels would drop by around 5 decibels. Implementation of continuous descent would be the single largest improvement to the local noise environment that could be made.

Councillor Dean said the aim appeared to be to reduce congestion in London airspace and there was no reason to pick one part of the district over the other.

Councillor Cheetham said that given that LAMP Phase 2 was to begin in 2018, it was strange to propose these SID use changes now. Focussing on continuous descent should be the priority instead.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Peachey said that delays for passengers on the ground were normally very small and the consultation had taken into account increased airport usage. The Airport could eventually have problems during peak periods, but it would not be an issue now. When aeroplanes were under 4,000ft noise reduction was the priority, between 4,000 and 7,000ft the aim was to avoid population centres.

Councillor Rich said it was clear the driver was not a reduction in CO² emissions. His worry was that making changes now could establish protocols that could set a precedent that could be used to justify LAMP Phase 2 changes. The suggested response in paragraphs 29 and 30 of the report should form the basis of the Council's response.

Councillor Cheetham suggested that the response should state that it was not yet clear how the changes could be justified. Any change should be delayed until LAMP Phase 2 in 2018.

AGREED that the following response would be issued relating to the NATS consultation:

- As there is no "win-win" situation for local residents, extreme care must be taken in making a judgement about the merits or otherwise of this proposal. In the

Aviation Policy Framework (APF), the Government says that it wants *“to strike a fair balance between the negative impacts of noise (on health, amenity (quality of life) and productivity) and the positive economic impacts of flights”* (Paragraph 3.3). In Paragraph 3.12, the Government states that its overall policy on aviation noise is *“to limit and, where possible, reduce the number of people in the UK significantly affected by aircraft noise”*. Under this proposal more people would experience more overflying than the number who would experience less, and there is also the effect to consider of increased overflying of Gt Easton Primary School. NATS and London Stansted Airport should therefore be asked to clearly explain to the CAA how this proposal would comply with Government policy in the APF and its guidance on environmental airspace design objectives. If this proposal is to be implemented, there should be a prior examination of whether the use of performance based navigation could reduce the effect on the primary school by either finding an optimal path within the Clacton 04 NPR swathe or by practicing dispersal.

- There may be wider benefits of this proposal from improved fuel efficiency, reduced CO² emissions, reduced passenger delays and reduced congestion in the London airspace. It is not clear, however, how these are to be weighed against Government policy and guidance on mitigating noise impacts below 4,000ft.
- It was unclear what justification there was for changing the usage of SIDs now, given that the LAMP Phase 2 consultation in 2018 was likely to significantly change the usage of London airspace.

SAP12

DFT NIGHT FLYING RESTRICTIONS AT HEATHROW, GATWICK AND STANSTED

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said the Government had not proposed any significant changes and the three year regime to 2017 would retain the main features of the current regime. The movement limits had been the same since 2006/07 and the noise limits had remained the same since 2011/12.

The Government had received evidence during its Stage 2 consultation about an unforeseen increase in demand for night-time flights at Stansted, which would mean that the existing movements limit would impose additional industry costs by 2017. The Government has indicated that it was not convinced by the robustness of the projections, but will monitor the new regime from the outset for any actual operational implications. The Government had also proposed a number of environmental objectives for airports as these were required under EU law.

In response to a question by Councillor Cheetham, the Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer confirmed that the 2003 S106 agreement for expansion to 25mppa did oblige the airport operator not to seek any relaxation of the regime in force at that time. Whether these current rolled-forward restrictions counted as a new regime was a matter of conjecture. From what the Government had said, it did seem likely that it had already received representations about relaxing the existing movement limits at the airport. The key point was that the Government had not agreed any relaxation of the movement limit at this stage.

The Panel noted the report.

SAP13

CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY – “MANAGING AVIATION NOISE”

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said the CAA had published “Managing Aviation Noise” on 29 May 2014. It was a useful document which could be used as evidence by the Council when dealing with aircraft noise matters. The key recommendations included incentivising operational approaches that mitigated noise, ensuring that residents benefitted more from additional capacity, airports that were seeking expansion to increase spending on noise mitigating measures, airlines focussing on noise performance when purchasing new aircraft and that landing charges should be structures to incentivise the use of less noisy aircraft.

The CAA was keen to encourage the use of noise envelopes that were linked to throughput increases. This had been picked up by the Airport Commission.

Councillor Cheetham said MAG had created more sub-groups which had improved dialogue between the Airport and the Council. The groups could be opened up more to include parish councils that are most affected by the Airport.

The Panel noted the report.

SAP14

MAG DRAFT SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR STANSTED AIRPORT

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that the Plan had been released on 2 September and was subject to a 10-week consultation period ending on 7 November. In the Plan, MAG said it was committed to honouring its 35mppa planning obligations, but due to the length of time since they were established some have expired whilst others are potentially outdated. MAG said it would be working with the local authorities on a review of those obligations to ensure that they remain relevant and robust. MAG was also anticipating a growth in cargo operations, which might have longer term implications for the number of night flights.

It was expected that the Airport would reach 35 mppa by 2025 and 45 mppa by 2035. Given the current permissions in place it was likely that there would be a planning application for an additional 8mppa. That application would likely be determined by the Council as it would not count as a major infrastructure project.

SAP15 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting would be decided at a later date.

A meeting with MAG would be arranged to discuss the draft Sustainable Development Plan for Stansted Airport.

SAP16 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

In response to questions by the Panel the Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said the issue of long waiting times to pass through security had been raised. A part cause of this was likely to be the ongoing terminal transformation project

Members discussed the proposed footpath / cycleway improvements from Takeley to the airport along Parsonage Road / Coopers End. Councillor Jones said despite correspondence about the footpath, progress on the scheme had stalled. Pressure needed to be put on the Airport so they fulfilled their obligation.

Councillor Rich said the most recent South Area Community Forum was very successful. The presentation by MAG highlighted that some small businesses in the district had more apprentices than the airport. Secondly, the Airport was not engaging enough with schools. It was important that members of the Panel were proactive in helping the Airport and schools work together.

Councillor Cant mentioned that passenger set down was no longer provided for in the Orange short stay car park. The Planning Policy / DM Liaison Officer confirmed that set down was now on the terminal forecourt, but pick up spaces continued to be provided in the Orange car park as per the 2003 planning obligation.

The meeting ended at 8.45pm.