

**STANSTED MOUNTFITCHET PARISH COUNCIL****FULL COUNCIL**

MINUTES of a meeting of the COUNCIL held at 7.45pm on Wednesday 6 April 2011 at Crafton Green House, 72 Chapel Hill, Stansted Mountfitchet, Essex

**PRESENT:** Cllr G Sell (Chairman), Cllrs C Dean, B Gott, J Hudson, P L Jones, J Loughlin, T Owen, R Rawlinson, J Rich, J Salmon, W Stiles and V Trundle

**ATTENDING:** N Barton Esq – Managing Director, Stansted Airport Ltd  
Mrs R Clifford – Clerk  
Cty Cllr Ray Gooding  
4 members of the public

**409 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs I Evans and J Freeman.

**410 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr C Dean as a member of Stop Stansted Expansion.

**411 MINUTES**

There being no amendments, the minutes of the meetings held on 16 March and 6 April 2011 were signed as a true record.

-----  
Mr Woodcock referred to questions he had raised at the STACC meeting relating to aircraft noise.  
-----

**412 TO WELCOME MR NICK BARTON, MD OF STANSTED AIRPORT LTD**

The Chairman welcomed Mr Barton and invited him to address the meeting.

Mr Barton stated that he had been Managing Director of the airport for six months but had been a Director for six years. Stansted Airport had been designed, technically speaking, as “the best airport in the world” and since 1995 has been the main centre for low-cost airlines – 98% of its business. It is efficient because of design decisions taken when it was expanded and has recently received an award for “World’s Best Low-Cost Airport”.

There has been a significant decline in air traffic over a 41 month period – closely related to the economy – however, most staff have been retained, no redundancies have taken place and they are now advertising 108 seasonal positions with over 20 applications being received for each position. The Competition Commission has now decided that BAA must sell Stansted Airport and this is highly likely to happen. The airport must continue to do a good job for its passengers and not worry about a change in ownership. Government policy stated that no second runway is envisaged here for decades. There is capacity to grow from the current 18m passengers per annum (mppa) to 35mppa on the single runway and BAA is doing nothing to promote a second runway. The decision not to proceed with a second runway has left a £100m write-off and just short of 300 properties in the locality. These will be sold back into the housing market discreetly over a period of time.

The airport is showing weak signs of recovery. With regard to noise, they are promoting use of Code F aircraft (a 757 is Code D and a jumbo jet is Code E). The code is largely determined by the size of the aircraft and Stansted can cope with Code F planes on ten stands (Airbus A380, Boeing 747-800 series). Long-haul carriers will use these planes in the future and whilst they are noisier than some planes (737-800 and Airbus A320) they are much quieter than the existing 747's which they replace. Three such planes are coming to Stansted in September 2011.

Events on the horizon are a major risk for the airport but also a massive opportunity – a State visit by the American President in May and the Olympics in 2012. The lion's share of spectators will arrive at Stansted, whilst competitors and their luggage are scheduled to use Heathrow.

Cllr Sell thanked Mr Barton and took the opportunity to place on record the position of the Parish Council relating to the airport – the Council has never been anti-Stansted Airport, but was opposed unanimously to a second runway. He hoped that the Council's relationship with BAA would continue to improve and that the old practice of meeting twice per annum could be resumed. Mr Barton welcomed this and asked that the Clerk liaise with his secretary to set a date for the next meeting which would take place at the airport. Questions from members were invited.

Cllr Sell asked how the train service to Liverpool Street/Stratford would cope with the increase in passengers arriving for the Olympics? NB explained that there are three firms authorised to sell complete packages, ie travel, accommodation etc and the airport is working closely with them. The new trains will all be 12 car stock and will run with excess capacity. It is expected that a lot of "ordinary" traffic will drop off during the period of the Games. Many passengers will also travel by coach as part of their package.

Cllr Loughlin asked if Ferrovial were unhappy about the decision not to proceed with the second runway? NB stated that they had paid a massive cash premium and within weeks lots of things started to go wrong – however, despite them getting no return out of Stansted Airport, they continue to be very supportive of the airport and are investing capital – they are not promoting a second runway.

Cllr Rich asked about the airport's attitude to local transport – ie when there are problems on the railway line, it appears to be the commuter who suffers while the airport trains take priority and are not stopped to collect local passengers. The service for local people who work at the airport is poor. NB apologised if there was a feeling along these lines, but stressed that the airport has no involvement in the timetabling of the trains and derives no income from them. They are invited to make representations but are blamed for some of the decisions. NB had authorised spending £2 million to ensure that the 12-car trains could be brought in on the line otherwise the airport would have lost services to Stratford – BAA has paid for platform lengthening.

Cllr Dean welcomed the Chairman's comment on the relationship with the airport – she hoped that the reconciliation would continue and pointed out that it was thanks to BAA that the local bus service has improved.

Cllr Sell referred to the numbers employed at the airport. NB stated that 11,300 people roughly are employed within the airport boundary, with 1300 of those working for BAA. 1 in 10 of the employees is from Uttlesford, but a good number also come from Harlow. Cllr Sell referred to the closure of several businesses at the airport, but employee numbers quoted appear to be the same – how is this explained? The total number of employees had peaked at 13,000, the head count has gone up slightly and also 400 more security staff have been employed. With regard

to employees getting to work, the airport offers a car-share scheme, a train ticket incentive scheme and grants for bicycles.

Cllr Jones referred to airport parking in the village which is getting worse particularly around Foresthall Park – unsurprising given the 510 bus route. Why are communities asked to report this to BAA if there is nothing that they can do to prevent it? NB explained that the airport has a good working relationship with UDC and Highways who can take action and it is keen to work with authorities in order to remain a good neighbour.

Cllr Jones then referred to flight-paths – some have recently been reviewed and it seems that this area may suffer more noise from Luton and City airports. NB confirmed that there is nothing currently going on with airspace planning. There was pressure some years ago which resulted in the NATS consultation, but they were swamped with representations on this and the scheme was kicked into touch – not least because demand has fallen. With regard to helicopters, these are not sound suppressed and there are no designated routes. However, if the airport is aware of consistent problems it can take up the issue with the owners.

With regard to compensation payments (Part 1 claims) – these go with the land and will be unaffected by the change in ownership of the airport.

In response to Cllr Stiles, NB stated that BAA does not own any land within Stansted parish. Details of the re-sale of the properties back into the housing market will be kept confidential so as not to distort the local market. Cllr Loughlin made the point that some people moved out of communities when their homes were compulsorily purchased – the properties may be sold back, but you cannot repair the community. NB stated that the figures showed that very few people actually moved away from the area as a result.

The Chairman thanked Mr Barton again for attending the meeting and the Clerk undertook to arrange another meeting with Denise Parker. Mr Barton left at 8.58pm.

#### **413 MATTERS ARISING**

387 – Lower Street/Grove Hill parking scheme – Chris Stoneham has now written to the objectors to this scheme and it is hoped that further progress can be made after the deadline of 6 May.

#### **414 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

- a Monthly report from PCSO Stranger.
- b Letter from Mr Phillips of Coltsfield relating to further development in the village – copy to go to each member.

.

**415 QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIRMAN** - None.

#### **416a DISTRICT COUNCILLORS' REPORT**

Cllr Sell reported that a consultation on how to spend the New Homes Bonus should take place in Autumn 2011.

#### **416b COUNTY COUNCILLOR'S REPORT**

Cty Cllr Gooding stated that the plans for the new St Mary's primary school had been passed earlier in the day. Some concerns were raised with regard to picking up and

dropping off pupils and Highways will be approaching UDC to see if any on-street parking can be incorporated into the square to be constructed close to the school. There was a general feeling that the plans, particularly with regard to vehicular movements, had not been well thought out. With regard to the risk of noise, sound surveys have been carried out and there is a condition requiring further surveys within two months of the opening of the school – inside and outside.

**391 FINANCE**

The list of cheques for signature was approved.

**392 PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED FOR COMMENT**

- a UTT/0283/11/CLP – The Nook, Burton End  
Certificate of lawfulness for proposed extension to side to increase building by 25%

No comment

- b UTT/0295/11/FUL – 5 Millfields  
Single storey side extension

No comment

- c UTT/0330/11/OP – 1 Blythwood Gardens  
Outline application for erection of one dwelling

Members considered this proposal to be over development and out of keeping in the street scene

- d UTT/0459/11/DFO – South Gate Hotel site, Thremhall Avenue, Stansted Airport  
Landscaping details following outline – details of access, appearance, layout and scale

Members considered the landscaping proposals to be inadequate to screen the development – needs improvement

- e UTT/0461/11/REN – The Old Dairy, 6 Blythwood Gardens  
First floor extension with dormer window to east elevation – renewal

No comment

- f UTT/0473/11/FUL – 4 Blythwood Gardens  
First floor extension over existing garage

98

No comment

- g UTT/0272/11/FUL and 0273/11/LB – Bentfield House, Bentfield Bower  
Demolition of single storey additions. Erection of rear conservatory and single storey rear extension. Replace bay window with French doors, removal of chimney stack and insertion of sash window. Internal alterations

No comment

- h UTT/0432/11/FUL – additional school land, Foresthall Park

Erection of 39 dwellings including access, parking and landscaping

Members considered this application to be premature. There appears to be inadequate land for parking on the adjacent primary school site. Discussions should be held between the landowners, education authority and district council to see if some of the land could be secured, under a section 106 agreement, for additional car parking for the school.

- j DM/MW/CC/UTT/13/11 – land adjacent to Reeve Road, Foresthall Park  
Construction of 300 place primary school with 21 car parking spaces including one for disabled, hard and soft play areas, habitat area and associated landscaping

Members recalled that the school hall, kitchen and toilets were to be accessible to the general public for hire outside school hours and queried whether the layout as proposed would enable this to work securely. In addition, and as mentioned in (i) above, they believed that the car parking provision was inadequate. This had been mentioned by the Headteacher and a representative of the Governors at a recent meeting stating that whilst the provision would meet the school's needs now, it would not be adequate when the school reaches full capacity. Request discussion with all parties in an effort to secure further land, from the adjacent site, for further parking. Cty Cllr Gooding stated that he would request that this application be determined by committee at County Hall.

- i UTT/0456/11/FUL – 20 Cawkell Close  
Two storey rear and single storey side extension

No comment.

**In view of the time (10.08pm) and in line with Standing Orders, the Chairman then proposed that the meeting be closed with remaining items held over to the next Council Meeting. Agreed.**

Meeting closed 10.10pm