

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7pm on 10 MAY 2016**

Present: Councillor K Artus (Chairman)
Councillor J Davey, T Farthing, P Fairhurst and J Lodge.

Officers in attendance: J Pine (Planning Policy/DM Liaison Officer) and A Rees
(Democratic and Electoral Services Officer).

SP5 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no apologies for absence.

Councillor Artus declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of SASIG.

SP6 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 NOVEMBER 2015

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

SP7 MATTERS ARISING

(i) SP3 – Presentation from MAG on RNP1 (RF) Trial at Stansted Airport

The Chairman said that although Ryanair agreed with the principle of the trial, they were still not a part of it as Boeing had still not implemented the required technology.

The Chairman then spoke in response to a question by Councillor Fairhurst. He said that some airports had adopted the procedures and some had not. In a sparsely populated area such as Uttlesford adoption of the procedures made sense because it meant that entire towns and villages could avoid being overflowed. In a densely populated area such as London this would not be the case.

**SP8 RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION BY THE CIVIL AVIATION
AUTHORITY (CAA)**

The Planning Policy/DM Liaison Officer said the consultation was about proposed changes to the process when a sponsor put forward a proposal for a permanent change to the published airspace structure. Before putting forward the proposal for consultation, the CAA had commissioned a review of the current process from Helios.

Responses to the consultation were being sought via an online portal, and the consultation itself was comprised of 40 questions. He said that changes should be supported as they would provide additional transparency to the process,

especially through extra public engagement and the inclusion of 4 gateway stages which would all require sign-off by the CAA.

The Planning Policy/DM Liaison Officer said that the CAA had shied away from implementing an appeals mechanism, although such a mechanism was suggested by Helios. The Chairman noted that the only alternative to an appeal would be a judicial review. This would create a lengthy process so it seemed prudent for an appeals mechanism to be included.

The Planning Policy/DM Liaison Officer explained that the CAA would have to issue guidelines about the appeals process. It was expected that if an appeals process was implemented, the appeal would only be over the process followed and not the decision itself. Then, in response to a question by Councillor Lodge, he said that an appeal would only be lodged at Stage 5B and not at every gateway sign-off.

The Chairman added that there was nothing to prevent interested parties from giving notice at the conclusion of other stages in the process that they intended to appeal.

The Planning Policy/DM Liaison Officer said that for significant changes (Level 1 changes up to 7,000ft), a public evidence session would be held. It was anticipated that public participation at these evidence sessions would be similar in nature to the public speaking procedure at the Council's Planning Committee. Officers felt that it would be more beneficial if the public evidence sessions were more similar to planning hearings, which were more open discussions between the interested parties led and moderated by a Planning Inspector.

It was explained that at altitudes up to 4,000ft, the Government had prioritised the reduction of noise, from 4,000-7,000ft noise reduction was balanced with lowering CO2 emissions. Above 7,000ft the priority was reducing CO2 emissions. In response to a question by Councillor Fairhurst about the flexibility of this approach, the Planning Policy/DM Liaison Officer said that the legislation could change in the future. For example aircraft could become quieter meaning that CO2 emissions could be prioritised at a lower altitude.

The CAA was also not proposing public evidence sessions for Level 2 changes. This would be acceptable in most cases, but some Level 2 changes would attract a great deal of public interest so it was deemed sensible to suggest that the need for a public evidence session was reviewed as part of the process for each submitted proposal.

The Chairman said that it was important that when the CAA appraised proposals N70 noise metrics were used to ensure the most accurate information possible was included. The CAA needed to ensure that all valid options were included

AGREED to recommend to Cabinet that:

1. The Council supports the CAA's proposal for a revised airspace change process subject to the additional comments set out in the report in paragraphs 18-27
2. Officers send the Council's response via the dedicated online platform that the CAA has set up by the consultation closing date of 15 June.
3. Following the Cabinet resolution, and in consultation with the Panel Chairman, officers add any other points of detail that they subsequently feel are appropriate and which give added weight to the Council's response, such as may arise from SASIG's discussion of the consultation.

SP9

GOVERNMENT AVIATION POLICY – VERBAL UPDATE

The Planning Policy/DM Liaison Officer said that SASIG had issued a newsletter which suggested that the upcoming EU Referendum would delay any decision on potential airport expansion until the end of the year. The Department for Transport (DfT) had commissioned further work which would also cause a delay. The DfT had also begun the process of reviewing the framework for making such a decision, and therefore it was assumed that the review would have to be completed before any decision on airport capacity was made.

Councillor Lodge commented that it seemed bizarre that the process was being delayed after the Davis Commission had finished its work. Councillor Fairhurst added that there were a number of EU directives which could slow the process down even further.

The meeting ended at 7.30pm.