

GATWICK AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING HELD ON 26TH JUNE, 2003

Minutes of the meeting of the Consultative Committee held on 26th June, 2003.

Present:- Mr. P.W. Bryant (Chairman)

Mr. J. Brock (Substitute)	-	Burstow Parish Council
Mr. S. Buck (Substitute)	-	International Air Carriers Limited
Mrs. H. Clack (Substitute)	-	Surrey County Council
Mr. C. Hersey	-	Mid Sussex District Council
Mr. R.A. Jones	-	Burstow Parish Council
Mrs. E. Kitchen	-	Horsham District Council
Mr. B. Kendall (Substitute)	-	Horley Town Council
Mr. G. Larcombe	-	Horley and District Chamber of Commerce
Mr. N.F. Maltby	-	Mole Valley District Council
Mr J. McCall	-	Environmental and Amenity Groups
Mr. J. Macdonald	-	International Air Transport Association
Mr. K. Morris (Substitute)	-	BATA
Mr. D. Murdoch	-	Crawley Borough Council
Mrs. M. Myland	-	Tandridge District Council
Mrs. S. Parsons (Substitute)	-	ABTA
Lt. Col. Pemberton	-	West Sussex County Council
Mr. G. Pixley	-	Passenger Representative
Mrs. D. Ross-Tomlin	-	Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
Mrs. E. Sampson	-	Surrey County Council
Mrs. H. Sewill	-	Charlwood Parish Council
Mr. A. Skudder	-	Crawley Borough Council
Mr. J. Woodward-Nutt	-	Consumers' Association

Also present:

Mr. R. Cato	-	Chairman and Managing Director, BAA Gatwick
Mrs. C. Nicholls	-	Communications Director
Mr. T. Lockwood	-	Director of Planning & Environment, BAA Gatwick
Mr. P. Grindrod	-	Department for Transport
Dr. J. Godfrey	-	Deputy Honorary Secretary
Mrs. P. Street	-	Assistant Honorary Secretary

Apologies for absence were received from Mr. G. Blundell-Pound, Mr. D. Dewdney, Dr. P. Ellis, Mr. P. Feltham, Mrs. K. Hammond, Mr. B. Humphreys, Mr. C. Lloyd, Mr. I. Moore, and Mr. R. Thomas.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF GENERAL PURPOSES SUB-COMMITTEE

164. The Committee noted the minutes of the special meeting of the General Purposes Sub-Committee held on 29th May, 2003 (copy attached to the signed minutes).

THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF AIR TRANSPORT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM: SOUTH EAST SECOND EDITION CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

165. The Committee considered a report by the Honorary Secretary commenting on the options for Gatwick Airport contained in the second edition of the Government's consultation on the Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: South East (copy attached to the signed minutes). Members noted that BAA plc., had on 12th May, 2003 published its response to the consultation, and this had been taken into account in the Honorary Secretary's report.

166. Mr. Cato explained BAA's position to the Committee. BAA believed that the Government should have a firm but flexible airports policy framework clearly identifying the intended location of additional runway capacity and those areas where no expansion is to take place to remove unnecessary blight. It also believed that the Government should take steps to safeguard land around sites for possible future development up to 2030. Mr. Cato also explained that nationally there was a balance to be struck in weighing up the economic benefits to the UK of airport expansion and its environmental impacts. BAA had therefore put forward eleven key tests to be applied to the Government's policy to ensure it is sustainable and provides an effective airport development strategy.

167. As regards the location where expansion should take place, Mr. Cato confirmed that BAA was of the view that a new runway at Gatwick should be included in a shortlist of four possible sites from which the Government should select up to three in the White Paper. BAA also believed that the close parallel runway option had fewer environmental impacts than the wide spaced option which delivers more capacity. However, in respect of the close parallel option BAA had put forward to the Government an alternative layout showing a slightly wider separation of the runways. Without a wider separation between the runways BAA believed that the forecast air traffic movements could not be achieved. Two other significant issues in respect of the Gatwick options were the earthworks required for the northern runway option and

surface access infrastructure generally the scale and costs of which had not been properly accounted for in the consultation. BAA felt that the Government should give direction and certainty of funding to enable the strategic transport providers to work with the airport operators to deliver rail and road infrastructure required to support the development of airports.

168. The Honorary Secretary informed the Committee that the General Purposes Sub-Committee had considered the suggested response and recommendations at its meeting that morning and had suggested minor amendments to recommendation (5). The revised recommendation was circulated to the Committee for consideration (copy attached to the signed minutes).

169. The Committee noted the work undertaken by BAA at Heathrow to improve the predicted capability of the SERAS air quality modelling. The results of this study had revealed a dramatic difference in the assumptions given in the SERAS documentation. Whilst members were encouraged by the results produced by BAA, it was crucial that the revised model and predictions were independently verified in order to provide confidence in the revised air quality modelling and to ensure its robustness. Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, questioned the way in which the improvements in air quality could be achieved and asked if this could be implemented sooner rather than later to improve the current air quality levels around Horley. BAA Gatwick would report back to Mrs. Ross-Tomlin direct. As regards the Committee's response to the question on the unacceptable impacts on the individual airport options, members felt that a more positive stance on air quality should be put forward.

170. Reference was made to the suggested response to question 18 and the noise level by which properties would be eligible for noise insulation. Whilst the suggested level of 63 dBA or more during the day was generally acceptable provided there was flexibility to widen the criteria in sparsely populated areas where the ambient noise level is lower, some members felt that it should be those properties within the 57dBA contour that should be eligible. This would be pointed out in the response to the Government.

171. There was some concern that the consultation document did not address the issue of flooding in areas around Gatwick, particularly in the Mole Valley, which is of concern to the local community. It was agreed therefore that reference would be made to flooding in the Committee's response to the questions posed in the consultation document. This would also be included in the response to the questions.

172. Resolved:

- (1) That it is the majority view of the Committee that the 1979 legal agreement should be upheld and that the Government be urged to make

an announcement regarding its stance as soon as practicable after the close of the consultation period;

- (2) That BAA plc be urged to be more emphatic in its response and state that the Government should not overturn the legal agreement;
- (3) That the Consultative Committee rejects the two additional runways option and the ability of Gatwick to operate as a major hub airport;
- (4) That, while recognising the potential national and regional economic benefits of an additional runway at Gatwick after 2019, the Consultative Committee advocates caution in taking forward any development proposals without:
 - (a) ensuring that the environmental impacts are capable of being contained and minimised; and
 - (b) the necessary resources being in place at the appropriate time to provide the proper level of all the necessary infrastructure needed to support the development.
- (5) That, before the Government considers the option of including an additional runway at Gatwick, the Consultative Committee advocates a further and fully inclusive stakeholder consultation on how the environmental and infrastructure impacts would be capable of being contained and minimised in relation to the runway development and the necessary supporting infrastructure.

However, in relation to recommendations (4) and (5) above, majority of the Committee believe that the implied environmental impact arising from both the development of an additional runway and the necessary supporting infrastructure cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, in which circumstances an additional runway could not be contemplated.

- (6) That the response to the consultation based on the principles set out in the previous response and the analysis advanced in this report as set out in Appendix 3, be approved and submitted to the Government;
- (7) That, in the event of no additional runways for Gatwick being included in the White Paper, the Consultative Committee continues to pledge its full support to BAA Gatwick in ensuring that investment is made available to implement the proposals contained in the Gatwick Sustainable Development Strategy and in accordance with the timetable provided therein.

DEPUTY HONORARY SECRETARY

173. The Committee noted that Dr. John Godfrey, Deputy Honorary Secretary to the Consultative Committee had been appointed Clerk to the Sussex Police Authority with effect from 1st September 2003 and will be leaving County Hall, Chichester in August. Members thanked Dr. Godfrey for his work and commitment to the Committee and wished him well in his new role.

CHAIRMAN