

STOP STANSTED EXPANSION UPDATE

Our Community –

Our Responsibility!



Local people celebrating victory outside the High Court following the last SSE legal challenge in November 2002

Latest news on the High Court challenge

At time of going to press we are being advised that 13 December is to be the start date for the Judicial Review hearing which will challenge the proposals for a second runway at Stansted. Meantime we are working intensely with our legal advisers and counsel to ensure that we are able to present the strongest possible case to the Court.

The High Court action being mounted by Stop Stansted Expansion and others will be heard alongside a similar legal challenge which is being pursued by Uttlesford, East Hertfordshire and North Hertfordshire District Councils and by Essex and Hertfordshire County Councils.

Win or lose, these legal challenges are an important first step in the battle to thwart BAA's massive expansion plans for Stansted. They are just a taste of what is to come over the next two or three years.

Read on for more details...

Fact!

Stansted Airport has not made a viable commercial profit since 1971 and has relied on cross-subsidies from Heathrow and Gatwick to keep it afloat.

However, a CAA ruling in 2003 has thwarted BAA's plans to pay for a second Stansted runway with cross-subsidies from Heathrow and Gatwick.

BAA says that without cross-subsidies a second Stansted runway is not a commercially viable proposition.

Fact!

Ryanair and easyJet account for more than 90% of Stansted's business. Both these airlines have issued profits warnings this year.

Ryanair shares have fallen by a third since January 2004. Over the same period easyJet shares have lost over half their value.

Would you invest £4 billion in Stansted to meet the projected future growth in low-cost air travel?

Can a second Stansted runway be financially justified on the back of penny flights?

Fact!

Stansted Airport handled a record number of passengers last year but earnings fell by 9%.

Stansted has the lowest earnings per passenger of any BAA airport.

Car parking and airport shopping are the main sources of revenue at Stansted but Stansted still cannot earn enough money to provide an economic return on the existing investment.

BAA could earn a higher return in a building society savings account.

Our Community – C

Jobs galore!

LOTS of new jobs? Yes, of course! There would be tens of thousands of new jobs if Stansted were to become one of the world's largest airports.

But Uttlesford and East Hertfordshire already have just about the lowest unemployment rates in the country.

The local economy is thriving and broadly-based and the local workforce is amongst the most highly qualified and highly skilled in the land.

Not surprisingly, BAA already has difficulty in finding local people to fill jobs at Stansted. Most airport jobs are not highly paid and involve some pretty unsocial shift working in areas such as general maintenance and cleaning, security, freight and baggage handling, manning check-in desks, warehousing and driving.

Because of the shortage of local workers, BAA has for some time been making a major effort to recruit airport workers from London, for example in Hackney, Haringey, Newham and Tower Hamlets.

Free bus travel is offered as an incentive and about 700 new Stansted airport employees have been recruited from north and east London in the past five years.

Meanwhile, 270 skilled jobs – mostly local – have been lost at Stansted with the downsizing of FLS aircraft maintenance operations – a victim of the intense cost pressures from the budget airlines.

The Government tells us that it wants 50% of the next generation of school leavers to go on to university/higher education. Surely then, it's a new Technology Park we need for the future – not a monster airport.

Houses galore!

SO – where would all the new airport workers live?

Ah yes! – more houses would definitely be needed say the Government planners – in fact, tens of thousands more – built locally of course, because it's Government policy to minimise commuting.

And recognising that airport workers are generally not well paid – these would need to be low cost, 'affordable houses', say the Government planners.

But what is the price of an affordable

home for an airport worker on £6 an hour? And what is to stop better paid workers (for example, those earning high salaries in London) from snapping up the new affordable homes? In practice, how can they be reserved for airport workers?

And what about the needs of local people? The children of many local people are already unable to find homes locally because of the high price of housing. We do need affordable homes and local needs must not be put to the end of the queue.

Traffic galore!

IF Stansted were to expand as BAA would wish, then, in just over 10 years from now, the airport would be generating a volume of road traffic on a similar scale to that generated by Heathrow today (7,200 peak hour car journeys by 2015 compared to 8,200 peak hour car journeys at Heathrow today) – and that is even without a second runway!

Traffic levels would roughly double again if a second runway were to be developed.

Just getting in and out of Bishop's Stortford, Dunmow, Saffron Walden or Stansted Mountfitchet would become a very different experience. Whether taking the kids to school or going to the local shops – we would all suffer from the frustrations of increased traffic.

Traffic congestion would be bad for local business as well as for everyone else. And traffic pollution goes hand-in-hand with traffic congestion.

The area around Heathrow already falls below EU air quality standards and this has as much to do with the road traffic as with aircraft emissions.

Rail travellers too will be affected. BAA has told shareholders that, if it were to proceed with a second runway at Stansted, the development costs would be kept to a minimum.

Government policy is that the airport developer (BAA) would be responsible for meeting the costs of upgrading road and rail access to Stansted. If costs are to be minimised, the likelihood is that the required road and rail improvements would simply not materialise.

The cheapest option for BAA would be to ignore the problem of overcrowded trains and overcrowded roads. People living in cities accept this – so why shouldn't the people of Uttlesford and East Hertfordshire?

SSE is active in ensuring that the City's leading financial institutions fully understand the fragile economics of Stansted



BAA is not invincible

The idea of massively expanding Stansted Airport is not new. Plans for a four-runway airport go as far back as 1967 but two Public Inquiries and an independent Royal Commission all decided that no more runways should be built at Stansted.

The Inspector at the last Public Inquiry described the prospect of a second Stansted runway as:

"...nothing less than a catastrophe in environmental terms"

"... an unprecedented and wholly unacceptable environmental and visual disaster."

Yet another Public Inquiry will be needed to consider these latest expansion plans for Stansted. Indeed, there may well be two separate Public Inquiries this time around because BAA intends firstly to submit a planning application for maximum use of the existing runway and subsequently to submit a planning application for a second runway.

Our Responsibility!



How confident really is BAA?

If BAA was totally confident about its ability to implement its expansion plans for Stansted, why does it bother to issue tens of thousands of 'Plane Talk' leaflets attacking SSE?

Local BAA management claim to be supremely confident but the message from BAA Headquarters in London is slightly different. Here's what BAA Chief Executive Mike Clasper had to say when he addressed a City audience on 18 May 2004:

"The business case for Stansted Generation 2 rests upon three assumptions:

■ *That traffic at the airport will continue to grow, broadly as envisaged in the Government's own projections.*

■ *That, as a result, Stansted will be able to raise its charges to the level permitted by the regulatory ceiling set for the present five-year period, 2003-2008.*

■ *And that, in the next five-year settlement, 2008-2013, the CAA and the Competition Commission will agree to remunerate satisfactorily the first phase of the Stansted G2 project, which could just be operational at the back end of that period.*

However, if these assumptions are not met or circumstances turn out very differently, we will have to adjust our plans. Let me be quite clear, BAA will not ask its shareholders and lenders to support any project for which there is no sound business case. We have a licence to build not a mandate."

One City commentator remarked that Mike Clasper's three conditions seemed more like "three back doors to allow BAA to walk away from the Stansted project."



Significant campaign resources must continue to be focused on the political corridors of Westminster, Whitehall and Brussels

Yet again it will be down to the local community to convince the Independent Inspector at Public Inquiry to reject BAA's longstanding ambition to destroy some of England's finest heritage.

A Public Inquiry could begin taking evidence as early as next year and SSE is already engaged in intense preparatory work aimed at ensuring that we are not caught unawares and are in a position to mount a robust challenge to BAA's plans.

Winning the arguments

THE logic of the arguments against massive expansion of Stansted Airport is increasingly being understood by more and more people – in Parliament, in the City, amongst planners, in the local community and in the press.

BAA's own MORI poll showed that the more that people understood the issues, the more they were opposed to major expansion of Stansted. Those who were most in favour turned out to be those who knew least about it.

The campaign against a second Stansted runway is supported by more than 100

local parish and town councils; Uttlesford, East Hertfordshire, Harlow, North Hertfordshire, Epping Forest, South Cambridgeshire and Braintree District Councils; Essex and Hertfordshire County Councils; every local MP and MEP and the East of England Regional Assembly. This support is at all political levels and across all political parties.

It is almost unique to find such unanimity amongst politicians and, although our politicians are not always right, it seems unlikely that they can all be wrong on this particular issue.

Hitting home

TWO recent initiatives by BAA suggest that the power of our arguments is hitting home:

■ BAA published its now notorious 'Plane Truth' leaflet earlier this year in a clear attempt to discredit the Stop Stansted Expansion campaign. Full of distortions, this was seen by many people as a desperate attempt by BAA to recover lost ground, knowing that intense local opposition was putting its expansion plans at risk.

■ Mike Clasper, BAA Chief Executive, is

to join forces with his counterparts from the nuclear power, tobacco and alcohol industries in a new grouping of business interests aimed at countering campaign pressure groups. In agreeing to become Chairman of this new group, Mike Clasper acknowledged that campaigns can damage 'a company's long-term license to operate'.

SSE makes no apologies for seeking to deny BAA a 'long-term licence' to destroy our local environment.

Will it happen?

YES – if we simply lie back and allow it to happen. NO – if we stand together as a community and oppose BAA's plans every step of the way. Stop Stansted Expansion has the commitment, the determination and the expertise to defeat BAA and we are confident of doing so.

We already have some powerful allies and we have the huge advantage of almost 6,000 local members and online supporters from all walks of life whose expertise we can draw upon. BAA has never before met such powerful opponents as from this local community. We want to continue to build our resources as the battle progresses – in the Courts, in the City, in Parliament and at Public Inquiry.

Stop Stansted Expansion is fighting on behalf of the entire local community and we want everyone who believes that this local community is worth fighting for to join us and play a part. Let's defeat BAA's outrageous plans once and for all.

Together we can defeat BAA's plans

SSE has brought together a host of talented local volunteers from all walks of life and the campaign team now includes expertise which can deal with even the most complex and technical aspects of BAA's expansion proposals.

We have a powerful and winnable case but the team cannot do the job on its own. It would surely be inexcusable if we were to lose this



BISHOP'S STORTFORD

TWINNED WITH HOUNSLOW

campaign simply because we did not have the necessary funds to pay for legal proceedings, external consultants and other specialist independent advice as necessary.

Whether in the Courts, in the City or at Public Inquiry, we must present our case in the strongest and

most professional terms.

Please help in our ongoing appeal for funds.

APPEAL FOR FUNDS

STANDING ORDER MANDATE

Please pay: **Lloyds TSB plc**
Address: **North Street, Bishop's Stortford**
Sort Code: **30-90-84**
Account no: **1310292**
Account name: **Stop Stansted Expansion**



The sum of £5 £10 *other amount £ commencing on: / / 2004
and on this same day monthly thereafter until further notice.

Please provide your bank details below and return this completed form to SSE (see address at foot of page)

To: _____ Bank Sort Code:
Address _____ Account No:

Account Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

OR MAKE A DONATION:

I enclose a donation of £ (£10 qualifies you as a member for a year)

Please make cheques payable to 'Stop Stansted Expansion' and send with this form to SSE (see address below)

Title (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/other): _____ Full Name: _____
Address: _____
Postcode: _____
Telephone: _____ e-mail: _____