

**CLAVERING PARISH COUNCIL: PUBLIC MEETING**  
**Thursday 11th September 2008 8pm at Clavering Village**  
**Hall**  
**To discuss the**  
**G2 planning application for a second runway at Stansted**  
**Airport**

Present: 78 people signed the register of attendance.

Apologies from 10 others, unable to be present who asked for their objection to the G2 planning application to be recorded.

1. Edward Oliver, Chairman of Clavering Parish Council welcomed those present to the open public meeting of CPC and introduced the speakers. BAA had been asked to provide a speaker but declined and said they were all busy at another meeting with UDC. Purpose of meeting not to debate airport, but to consider expansion and 2nd runway. PC has not expressed a view up to now, sensing that views of village cover wide range. With coming of inquiry PC is looking for this meeting to clarify what actions to take. The chairman then invited the following to speak:
  
2. Uttlesford District Council - Cllr Edgar Abrahams, Member for Clavering said that Uttlesford District Council is 100% against the second runway. He gave the background of what has happened in the past 40 years: Stansted airport was built by the USAAF in WW2, bought by BAA after the war and used as a small local airport. 1969 proposals short-listed 4 possible sites, but Stansted was not one of them – if Nuthampsted had happened, Clavering would have been at the end of a runway – a public meeting was held in Clavering in April 1969, team formed, money raised and eventually the plan was not pursued by the Government. But in 1978 another White Paper listed 6 sites including Nuthampsted and Stansted, and Clavering had another public meeting in July 1979. This was followed by BAA seeking 15 million passengers per annum. Clavering supported the objectors and another public meeting was held here in May 1981. There was an

inquiry held at Quendon Hall in August 1981 – expansion was allowed to 8 million passengers but no second runway. In 2001 BAA true to form sought permission for 25 ppa. This was not thrown out at planning meeting Sept 02, but Government published more proposals, wanting 3 new runways. Another meeting was held in Clavering October 2002 here. Since then Clavering has not been pulling its weight in the fight against urbanisation. This is the 5th public meeting. Such a major urbanisation that we would be a suburb of Harlow plus noise of aircraft. To those who say it is a foregone conclusion, I say we have kept it off for 40 years and it is our duty to our children and grandchildren to preserve the peace and tranquillity of Uttlesford.

3. Essex County Council - Cllr Ray Gooding, Stansted Division, said the County Council was against the second runway and would be jointly working with other councils to oppose the plan at the inquiry. There was also a new group including Essex CC, Herts CC, Suffolk CC, Braintree DC, Uttlesford DC and East Herts DC, know as CO2, which is looking at the wider problems that a new runway would cause ref infrastructure etc, the bigger issues. There were a number of points: 1. airport demand – the second runway is not needed; 2. benefits do not outweigh disbenefits locally; 3. the noise over the wider area has been underestimated by the Government; 4. there would be increased traffic pressure on transport especially at junction 8 on the M11, on the A120 at Little Hadham and on the West Anglia main line. There were also impacts on local communities from those operations, on the historic landscape and air quality which has been largely rural up to now and is threatened. Also greenhouse gas emissions increasing air flights and segregated mode runway permission would ultimately mean that mixed mode would extend still further over those existing now. This case is going to be combated by the Government - they say they have taken those factors into account, we will see. We need to understand what Generation 2 would mean and what it actually involves = new runway parallel to existing one 3km long, new terminal, car parks, road links – lots of

land just for cars, new access from M11, new access from A120 and new rail tunnel at airport. M11 needs to be widened to 4 lanes between junctions 6 and 8, additional tracks on West Anglia main line. All those additional things would not be paid for by BAA, but paid for by taxpayers. To summarise the impact on communities in this area: aircraft noise considerably above figures stated, congestion on road and rail, destruction of nature of this area. Government says economy of SE region needs increased employment but the figures don't support that argument. They say need they additional flight capacity in south east, but analysis in the 2003 paper is being reviewed and downgraded with increased cost of fuel and uptake of air transport – the number of flights unlikely to grow as they suggested. So arguments are moving against it and we are fairly confident we can win. Regarding the sale of airports: Ferrovial is strapped for cash - the bidders who want to buy it would have to prove they have enough money to carry out those developments. That doesn't alter the economic situation, it doesn't necessarily mean it would be worth them spending it, so we hope they will see the light. But there is a battle to be fought and the work ECC is doing is in draft form, we are putting together details to fight this expansion and we are relatively confident we can win. No decision will be taken until 2010-11. By then there will be a change of government and by then economic realities will make a significant change to the way forward. One more detail – at ECC we are objecting to the Compulsory Purchase Order for land for development of some of the infrastructure which would go along with this plan. BAA actually have the right to present CPOs themselves, they took this over from the national company when it was privatised. The concern is that the successors to Ferrovial may also take on those rights, so we are fighting a big brother, we really need to win.

4. Stop Stansted Expansion - Mr. Brian Ross, Economics adviser to SSE: we really need to win this and we shall win it. Start with bad news – the threat we face today. Exactly 6 months ago BAA submitted application for

second runway. All the threats that went before over last 40 years - none of them got to a planning application, this one has done and that is serious. The planning application if you pile up the documents is 8 feet tall, it covers 17 different topic areas, takes up 50 volumes: it is substantial and has to be taken seriously. If approved Stansted would handle 68 million passengers per annum. This is 3 times more than today = more than Heathrow, more than any airport in Europe today and only two airports in the world, Chicago and Atlanta are bigger - so that is the scale of the threat. Also bigger than Heathrow today re numbers of flights and land area = 16.5 square kms of land. If you want to envisage what this means, close your eyes and think of a 10-mile radius of Heathrow. Clavering is 7-8 miles from Stansted or less. What happens is that an airport becomes a magnet for further development, warehouses, distribution, houses, offices, infrastructure, road, rail. Our worry is that within a generation you could see the transformation of this area into something that would look like Heathrow today. This is not primarily about aeroplane noise - that is an issue, traffic is an issue, this is about accumulation of effects, and threat of urbanisation, a rural area transformed into an urban area and all that entails in terms of quality of life. That is the seriousness of the threat. We need to ensure maximum opposition to BAA, because we are reasonably confident we can defeat this application. We had an inquiry last year - they were given approval to expand to 25 mppa in 2001, last year they wanted 35 mppa. There was a five months inquiry, ended in October, we are still waiting for the result. Odds are they will get that approval, but the planning application is for 68 mppa. We learnt a lot from that inquiry, we presented a good case and can build on that. It will start in April, will run at least a year to April 2010, the inspector will take at least 6 months to report, the final decision end of 2010 or early 2011. A lot of work to do between now and then. SSE and UDC etc at the inquiry will seek to persuade the inspector that the damage done by this development outweighs the benefits. We are absolutely confident we can do that. 20 years ago the inspector said that a second runway would

be an environmental catastrophe, even when we did not know about climate change. That is the same today. Taking all the issues – historic buildings, ancient woodlands, countryside etc – all those harms go on one side and on the other side BAA has to demonstrate the economic benefits. Most of the passengers are with Ryanair – 63% and the main purpose of the airport is to transport British people overseas to spend their money, how does it benefit the UK economy to encourage an Irish airline which buys American planes to transport millions of UK residents to spend their money in other countries? SSE has never been against the airport, it is an important local employer, but it is a question of moderation. This has always been a broadly-based local economy. To have a single employer of 30,000 people, sooner or later it no longer is the flavour of the month, you know what happens when a community is dependent on a single industry. We are not afraid of the planning inquiry, we are keen to present the arguments. We have had 20 people working on these documents for 6 months and when it starts we will be ready to answer the case. We will raise the money to fund barristers to ensure we give it our best shot. We are in good company along with ECC etc. We even have the airlines opposing it, Ryanair and Easyjet, not because they don't want a second runway, but they think this is too expensive, they probably want a cheap and cheerful alternative. The planning process isn't the only way. We fight it on several fronts, we may also fight it legally. When we get the inquiry decision of last year, we may challenge it – the law of the land is more powerful than Government policy. Ferrovial bought BAA for £10.5 billions - they borrowed it, and inherited £6.5 billions debt, so altogether they borrowed £16.9 billions. Suddenly interest rates up, credit crunch. Ferrovial have managed to, refinance but are still paying over a billion pounds in interest = more than their annual profit! They need to find £4.5 billion to develop Heathrow over the next 5 years. Where will they find the money to develop Stansted? It baffles me, the sums do not add up. At Stansted the return on investment would be less than what they are borrowing the money for. We can use that

to our advantage. Whatever they put forward, they can't do it on the cheap. The Competition Commission told them to sell two airports. So on the eve of the enquiry, BAA could be instructed to sell the airport, this is a big uncertainty. It would be an odd situation where they were just left with Heathrow, but promoting a second runway for a competitor at Stansted. It is not easy for them or us but that is the reality. We have campaigned for 4 years to break up the BAA monopoly. We will be delighted if Stansted gets sold off, any new owner might want a second runway but they would look very long and hard at it. We think also an effect of the Commission report is that the Government would no longer insist on a policy that the first new runway in the south-east should be at Stansted. If owned separately, the Government could not pursue that, and Stansted would be the last choice, not the first. Thus the regulatory framework is moving very much in our favour. The political wind is also moving in our favour. The present government - we can't change their mind. They have been entrenched with this policy for a long time. Any change of government would create a different policy. Although not in their manifesto, the Conservative party have said they would not proceed with it. We won't know for sure till it is formalised. This inquiry cannot finish on this side of a general election - the latest date for this is July 2010. So when the report goes to a new government it is unlikely to be them, that is encouraging. It shows the benefit if you can delay it, bearing in mind it was supposed to be halfway built by now. The very earliest it could be built is 2015-16 if we lost on every battleground. To summarise: we are confident we can stop a second runway, not sure whether it will be through planning, regulatory, legal, political or because it will just become clear it is not viable because we have upped the anti. We only have to win on one of those battlegrounds and I am confident we can. We have the support of all councils, every European MP in the east of England including Labour, UKIP, Conservative, Libdem, every MP within 20 mile radius including Labour, Conservative, Libdem. I thought we had the support of every parish council in Uttlesford and was stunned to

learn we did not have the support of Clavering. I encourage you to set the record right.

5. The chairman read out a letter from Sir Alan Haselhurst MP, who had been invited but was unable to attend, and sent his views objecting to the second runway plan:

**From: "HASELHURST, Sir Alan" <HASELHURSTA@parliament.uk>**  
**Date: 15 July 2008 15:28**

"I am sorry that I cannot be with you in person to stress how strongly I feel on the subject of Stansted Airport. If it is not felt to be a problem now in Clavering - and living as close as I do to the village that would surprise me - its future growth constitutes a deeply worrying prospect. In the early 1980's when I was first fighting the development of Stansted I remember being told in villages like Steeple Bumpstead, and often in the eastern part of the constituency, that the airport was not such a bad thing. People could see only a plus side. Some years later when throughput at the airport passed 8 million passengers per annum, and aircraft began stacking over Sudbury, an avalanche of protest came from those self-same villages. They didn't see it coming. People in this District should be warned. Continuing airport growth, let alone the imposition of a second runway, will change our environment for ever. Above all the second runway project must be, and with everyone's help, can be defeated".

**The Rt. Hon. Sir Alan Haselhurst M.P.**

Member of Parliament for Saffron Walden  
Chairman of Ways & Means and Deputy Speaker

Address: House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA  
Tel: 020 7219 5214 / 3340 Fax: 020 7219 5600  
E-mail: haselhursta@parliament.uk <mailto:haselhursta@parliament.uk>  
www.siralanhaselhurst.net

6. Questions from the public:

Simon Cooke: I was very interested in Brian Ross comments about urbanisation, I think it's very important to realise exactly what it means, it is not just extra people at the airport, but every extra person who works at the airport will need a new house, and for every family there has to be schools, shops, hospitals etc. And then businesses and warehouses etc. It will get bigger and bigger. All you need to do is go to Heathrow and think that in late 1940s that was surrounded by cabbage fields. This is more important than aircraft.

Tina Brown: Apart from persuading the parish council to give support, what can individuals do? Brian Ross replied: the most important thing is to send an email to Uttlesford District Council - a letter is even better but email will do, just saying you object, just a few lines. Much better to express a view, not standard letter. BAA is getting its staff at Heathrow and Gatwick to write in favour, a mean thing to do, and also asking passengers going through the airport to fill in letters! My nightmare at the inquiry is if local people have not sent in as many letters as supporters, because they think someone else will do it. So numbers count.

Peter Blomley: In your armoury of things to defend it, what about air pollution? It was said that nitrous oxide would exceed European requirements – why is that not stopping it? Brian Ross said BAA claim it won't exceed it, they have to demonstrate that. Nitrous oxide is close to the margin in the Stansted area. We argued they would exceed this in Hatfield Forest at the last inquiry. We challenged BAA numbers, so did the National Trust. For 3 days they said it was correct. In January 2008 BAA then went to the Government and said that the wrong information was given to inquiry, and would breach levels in the Forest. They claimed it was not mandatory and the Forest did not count. That's the main reason why we have been waiting a year for the result. The present application has air quality projections but BAA say they are not breaking rules, are within limits, but when you look at it, BAA has invented aeroplanes that don't exist! At the inquiry you can cross-examine people with stupid suggestions like that and the inspector can form his judgement. They will look silly.

John Smith: Is a petition to be arranged in local shops? The PC chairman answered that the next parish council meeting will decide if they would have a petition, but individual letters are a lot stronger than a petition with x number of names. Brian Ross agreed, saying that people sign a petition and then think they have done their bit.

David Curtis: Is the Government bound by the decision of its inspector, in which case the inquiry is just a pa exercise? Brian

Ross answered that the first job is to influence the inspector, cross that bridge first – he makes the recommendation, normally Secretary of State will go along with it, but our elected representatives have to make final decision. Re last inquiry, when it is announced the S of S issues reasons for decision. We are not worried as unlikely today's S of S would be there. The planning system is going to change, this inquiry could be the last one under the current system. In 2 years these decisions will be decided by civil servants through a new independent planning commission, but this application is under existing system.

Nigel Cook: How much money is budgeted by UDC and ECC?  
Ray Gooding said there was a report in the paper this week about UDC having problems meeting costs. UDC does have limited resources but ECC has pledged £3m to cover initial work to move forward and not capped it. Eggie Abrahams said that the big share is paid by county councils and we should get off fairly lightly.

Alan Payne: Could Edward take forward a vote of this meeting as a way of making feelings of village felt to parish council?  
Edward said yes there will be a resolution today.

Ray Lomas: Can we approach Rolls Royce to see if they believe in these engines to power these planes? Brian Ross answered that they do speak to Rolls Royce and aircraft manufacturers and they are trying to work on engines that are more economical, quieter and emit less, but fundamental contradiction between those objectives. Any plane flying in 2030 should be on the drawing board by now.

Ron Couchman: If resolution passed and parish council support it, could speakers give us ideas of what other villages are doing to support SSE? Brian Ross said that Takeley gave SSE £10,000 two years running! Ray Gooding said Berden, Manuden and Farnham have joined to fight some of problems with new flight paths and those things affect Clavering too, so Clavering could work with other parishes. Brian Ross said SSE does need money: last year they spent £130,000 at inquiry in 5 months, 22 witnesses and of that £60,000 to barristers, £10,000 on

documents, £60,000 on expert witnesses. UDC spent a lot more, but SSE mostly have volunteers. For every pound for experts we have ten pounds of support we don't pay for. BAA paid its lead barrister a million pounds, SSE barristers were just as good.

Eggie Abrahams: in Clavering if you go uphill you can see planes landing. This is a wonderful place to live, once they have been concreted you will never see them no more. The worst thing in Clavering now is increase in traffic. Let's save our countryside.

Barbara Weatherup: Do we know where they want the second runway? Brian described the route. The second runway would be further away from Clavering than the existing runway, but important to note that segregated mode means that all take off from one runway and land on other runway, and when wind changed direction, this would turn round. For Clavering most of takeoffs would be on the existing runway. One of the main departure routes, the westerly one heading south west, comes over Clavering, so all the take-offs on that runway on 2 days out of 3 would impact here directly.

There were no more questions. The chairman then invited Jacky Cooper to read out the names of those who were on holiday but wanted their views taken into account – they all wished to vote against the planning application (see names in Apologies). JC then spoke about the villages that were actually under threat nearer the airport, and urged those present to join the SSE runway ramble on Saturday 13 Sept in order to see for themselves the countryside which would be affected.

**Edward read the resolution to the meeting: "The residents of Clavering oppose the G2 planning application for a second runway at Stansted Airport." This was proposed by Simon Cooke and seconded by Gillian Cooke. Ron Couchman proposed an amendment adding the words: 'and call upon the parish council to do likewise'. This was seconded by Ray Lomas. Edward asked that non-residents should not vote. The**

**vote was taken. The result was unanimously in favour of the amended resolution.**

The Chairman thanked all the speakers for coming and Jacky Cooper for arranging the meeting.