



FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Notes of the Meeting held at 2.00pm on Thursday 20 November 2003 in the BAe Systems Park Centre

Present:

Chairman:

Mr R MacKay

User Representatives:

Mr M Khalek	GAMA Aviation
Mr T Sidebottom	Society of British Aerospace Companies
Mr L Rayment	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr R Walker	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Ms A Bartaby	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr J Batty	Business Aircraft Users' Association
Mr W Epton	Farnborough Operators' and Residents' Committee

Local Authority Representatives:

Cllr Mrs P M Devereux	Hampshire County Council
Cllr N Lambert	Hart District Council
Cllr R L G Dibbs	Rushmoor Borough Council
Cllr P G Taylor	Rushmoor Borough Council
Cllr M Drew	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Cllr D Maxwell	Surrey County Council

Local Interest Representatives:

Mr G Marks	Farnborough Airport Residents' Association
Ms J Radley	Fleet and Crookham Civic Society
Mrs D Knowles	Mytchett, Frimley Green and Deepcut Society
Cllr E Worrall	Ash Parish Council
Cllr V K Scrivens	Farnham Town Council
Mr R Kimble	Farnborough College of Technology

Secretary:

Mr G E T Green

1. INTRODUCTION OF NEW SECRETARY OF THE COMMITTEE

- 1.1 On behalf of the committee, the Chairman welcomed Mr G E T Green, whom TAG had recently appointed to be the committee's secretary.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Mrs M Hunt (Waverley Borough Council), Cllr Mrs D Bedford (Rushmoor Borough Council), Cllr C Hebborn (Crandall Parish Council), Cllr J Phillips (Surrey County Council) and Mr R Brodhurst (Aravco).

3. NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 17 JULY 2003

3.1 Accuracy

- 3.1.1 The notes of the meeting held on 17 July 2003 were approved as a true record, subject to the points made on two paragraphs:

3.3.2 Mr Marks said that, in this paragraph, he was referring to the judgment of Mr Justice Dyson in the R v Fairoaks Airport Ltd case, with which he agreed.

5.3 Mr Marks said that his discomfort, referred to in the third sentence of this paragraph, derived not from the fact that TAG had not persuaded the Department for Transport (DfT) to change its crash rates but because TAG continued to claim that the statistics are overstated, even though the national authority remain unconvinced.

3.2 Matters Arising

- 3.2.1 3.3.1 Cllr Dibbs said he had attended the meeting of Hart District Council's (HDC) Scrutiny Committee, which had considered HDC's and Rushmoor Borough Council's (RBC) representation on the Consultative Committee. He had put the case for the present arrangements, which were balanced and logical. It was clear, however, from Cllr Lambert's motion due to be considered under agenda item 3a, that Hart disagreed. In Cllr Dibbs' view, RBC surrendering one seat in favour of HDC would lead to an imbalance in the representation enjoyed by the two areas overall. He was, however, prepared to offer this, which would mean that RBC would be represented in future by himself, as the Cabinet member for the Environment, and the member for Knellwood ward.
- 3.2.2 Cllr Lambert welcomed Cllr Dibbs' remarks, thanked him and RBC for their cooperation, and withdrew the motion in his name under agenda item 3a.
- 3.2.3 6.2 Cllr Scrivens thought that the layout of the table was unsatisfactory and hoped this could be reconsidered for the next meeting. This was agreed. **[ACTION: TAG AND SECRETARY.]**
- 3.2.4 6.4 Mrs Knowles had not received the list of members of the public who had attended the previous meeting, and Ms Bartaby said she would arrange for them to be sent to her. **[ACTION: MS BARTABY.]**
- 3.2.5 6.6 Ms Radley said that her deputy is Colonel Robert Osborne.

[ACTION: SECRETARY.]

- 3.2.6 The Chairman invited all organisations represented on the committee to ensure they had nominated a deputy. **[ACTION: ALL BODIES REPRESENTED ON THE COMMITTEE.]**

4. ADOPTION OF CONSTITUTION

- 4.1 The committee gave consideration to the second draft of the constitution, which had been prepared in the light of the discussion at the meeting held on 17 July, and approved it.

5. EXPLANATION OF LEQ

- 5.1 Following the request made at the meeting on 17 July, Kathie Wood (TAG) gave a presentation to explain LEQ. Thanking her for her presentation, the Chairman said that the arrangements at Farnborough Aerodrome for monitoring noise were comparable with those in place at other major airports in the UK and elsewhere in Europe.

6. REVERSE THRUST

- 6.1 During the course of a long discussion, questions were asked about the circumstances in which reverse thrust (RT) was used; what monitoring was done of its use (including by different aircraft); what the S106 agreement said about the use of RT; the implications for RT of runway length and surface; whether there should be separate arrangements for monitoring the noise generated by RT; and whether TAG had taken steps to try to reduce the incidence of RT.

- 6.2 The following points emerged during the discussion:

i. RT was used as an additional safety measure when landing. It was effective only at speeds exceeding 90 knots. Standard guidance was that it should be deployed ready for use when landing. Pilots were, however, discouraged from actually using it unless the prevailing conditions required it: this had to be a judgment for the pilot to make. In the event of an accident, a pilot would be criticised severely if he or she had failed to deploy RT in circumstances which called for it. There was no reason for pilots to use RT unless it were necessary: passengers wanted as comfortable a landing as possible. RT was rarely used at Farnborough other than in "idle" mode;

ii. the former military runway was 2,400m. Based on the Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) aerodrome standards, and taking account of the factors that they required to be addressed, the landing distance was now 1,800m. This met the standard required by all aircraft operating from the airport;

iii. it was for the CAA to specify the surface friction characteristics required of runways;

iv. the S106 agreement required the company to discourage the use of RT except where it was required for safety reasons, and the procedures at the

airport reflected this. The requirement contained in the S106 agreement had, as the agreement specified, been published in the UK Air Pilot and the company's conditions of use;

v. TAG were not persuaded that it was necessary to monitor the use of RT. Mr Batty did, however, say that he would draw to the attention of his member companies the views that had been expressed, and would ask them to be sensitive, as always, to concerns about noise and to reduce it as far as possible. **[ACTION: MR BATTY.]**

6.3 Summing up the discussion, the Chairman said he was sure that TAG will have taken careful note of what had been said during the discussion, which, in line with the committee's purpose, had provided an opportunity for all sides to express their views.

7. TAG REPORTS

7.1 Report on Instrument Landing System (ILS) Checks and Aircraft Tracks

7.1.1 This report was prepared in the light of concerns expressed at the committee's meeting on 17 July about aircraft approach accuracy.

7.1.2 Mr Walker said that the checks of the track-keeping system, which were undertaken when the CAA's ILS calibration check was done in August, were done from the eastern end because of concerns that had been expressed by Farnborough College of Technology and because it provided good sightlines. In answer to Ms Radley, he said that he would check whether data, from the aircraft used in the checks and gathered as it passed over Crookham, could be made available. **[ACTION: MR WALKER.]**

7.1.3 It was noted that there was an error in the orientation of the mapping on the TAG track keeping system. This had been corrected, and it should be possible to obtain an entirely accurate picture from the ILS data, to include data relating to approaches from the Crookham direction. Mr Walker undertook to check whether the data that emerged from the checks could be presented on the basis of the new mapping. **[ACTION: MR WALKER.]**

7.1.3 Apart from claims that aircraft approached other than on the extended centre line, there was some discussion about the glide path angle. TAG were unaware of approaches that diverged significantly from the 3.5 degree glide path. Mr Khalek said there was a strong interest in keeping to this as accurately as possible. Mr Batty pointed out that air traffic control monitored incoming aircraft.

7.2 Report by TAG Farnborough Airport on proposed information report

7.2.1 Introducing the report, Ms Bartaby said that information about third party risk would be included in future reports.

7.2.2 Cllr Scrivens asked for the Complaints Line, referred to in Section 4 of the report, to be published, and the chairman asked for it to be included in the minutes (01252 526001). In answer to a further request from Cllr Scrivens, TAG said

they will provide more-detailed information about complaints in future Information Reports. **[ACTION: TAG.]**

- 7.2.3 Welcoming what was said in paragraph 5.3 of the report, about the European Flight Simulator Training Centre, Mr Marks said that the planning permission prohibited any flying in connection with the development, and he asked whether this restriction applied to TAG as well as to Flight Safety International (FSI). Ms Bartaby said that this particular restriction applied only to FSI; but TAG was in any case prohibited from undertaking flying training for novice pilots.

8. MATTERS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

- 8.1 The Chairman asked Ms Radley whether the Fleet and Crookham Civic Society had approved the terms of the questions for consideration by the committee and included in Paper C on the agenda. Ms Radley confirmed this was so. She added that she was sorry that an environmental acoustics expert who was familiar with this area had not been allowed to address the committee. Cllr Scrivens said that a number of local groups had available to them expert advisers, and it would be helpful to the committee if they could speak at meetings, as was provided for under the newly agreed constitution. The Chairman said he noted this view, but pointed out that the committee was still evolving and he hoped that acceptable and agreed procedures would emerge. It had also to be borne in mind that TAG's procedures for monitoring, and the noise contours themselves, were also developing. After perhaps another three months or so, more useful and more reliable information should be available.
- 8.2 It was recognised that some of the ground covered by the questions had been touched on in the earlier discussion. The Chairman agreed with a proposal that written replies to the questions should therefore be prepared **[ACTION: TAG]**, but he invited Ms Radley to put some of the questions in Paper C to the committee.
- 8.3 In answer to the query why incoming aircraft continued to fly over Church Crookham to the north of the extended 06/24 centre line, Ms Bartaby said this would be because the aircraft either were within the width of the glide path at that point or, more likely, were following the instructions of Air Traffic Control.
- 8.4 Mr Marks requested that, now that the map base had been corrected, new track plans should be prepared. TAG agreed to look at what could be provided. **[ACTION: TAG.]** In reply to the question how this affected the public safety zone (PSZ), Ms Bartaby said that the PSZ was based on the extended centre line of the runway as set by the DfT.
- 8.5 Ms Radley regretted not having the opportunity to put all of her questions to the committee and therefore to hear their reactions to the replies. She asked whether mobile sound-monitoring equipment could be trialled in Church Crookham, and was assured that it would be. **[ACTION: TAG.]**
- 8.6 The Chairman noted what was said under question 6 of Paper C about an alleged near-miss over Church Crookham, and said he understood the concern that such an incident, if it had happened, would cause.

9. REVIEW OF RUSHMOOR LOCAL PLAN

- 9.1 Mr Marks said that the Rushmoor Local Plan was due to be reviewed under the new "Fast Track" system, leaving controversial issues still to be subject to a local inquiry. He asked if the committee had any view on the likelihood of controversy if proposals were made to change the Local Plan to facilitate an expansion of flying. Cllr Dibbs said that the new framework for drawing up Structure Plans (in future to be called Regional Spatial Strategies) and Local Plans (in future, Local Development Frameworks) had no bearing on planning issues at the airport.

10. ACCESS TO STATISTICS SUPPLIED BY TAG UNDER THE SECTION 106 AGREEMENT

- 10.1 Mr Marks said he had asked RBC for the information relating to aircraft movement records which had been supplied by TAG to the council under schedule 1 of the S106 agreement. RBC had declined to do so as this was more appropriately done by TAG. TAG had, however, also declined to provide it. Cllr Dibbs said that RBC did not consider the information supplied by TAG to be yet in the public domain. The information would be considered by the council's Development Control committee in due course, at which time, it would be public. Although there was no duty on the council to do so, the information would be put on its website, at the appropriate time, subject to the resource implications.
- 10.2 Mr Marks said that the S106 agreement required the airport to provide RBC with an analysis of aircraft movements by runway used. However, the report "Farnborough Airport Environmental Reporting" did not show this detail but only summarised it. Mr Batty said that although the airport had, under the terms of the S106 agreement, to maintain a record of such information, they were required to provide RBC with only a summary - such as that given in the report.
- 10.3 A member of the public said that, if the detailed records were maintained, it should be easier to include these in the report than to create a summary of them. Ms Bartaby said that TAG were anxious that the committee should develop into a forum in which there could be open debate on the basis of as full information as possible. Referring to the overall demands made on the airport's relatively slender resources, she said that the airport would always try to provide information that the committee reasonably needed in order to discharge its responsibilities, and their task of doing this would be made easier if adequate notice were given. Mr Rayment invited Mr Marks to visit him to discuss the sort of information that he was seeking.
- 10.4 Mr Khalek said that TAG's formal responsibility under the S106 agreement was to report to RBC on the way in which it discharged its obligations under the agreement, and it was essentially for RBC to decide whether or not the company was meeting the requirements. While the committee had a legitimate interest in such matters, its main purpose was to provide a forum for the discussion of matters concerning the development or operation of the aerodrome, which had an impact on users of it and on people living or working in the surrounding area, rather than to make a further and separate judgment on the airport's position in relation to the S106 agreement. It was recognised that, for the committee to

discharge its responsibilities, it needed to have the necessary information.

11. FARNBOROUGH AIRSHOW 2004

11.1 Mr Sidebottom said that the 2004 show – to be held from 19 to 25 July - would be the first one under the lease arrangements with TAG. All the exhibition space had been sold, and there should be a good range of static and flying displays. Discussions with local services, such as the police and local authorities, had begun. To mark the 100th anniversary in 2004 of Rolls-Royce, the show would include a special event in which aircraft powered by the company's engines, including vintage aircraft, would take part. The show had a dedicated website – www.farnborough.com

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12.1 The Chairman said that TAG would invite Hart District Council to nominate a second member to serve on the committee. **[ACTION: MS BARTABY.]**

12.2 Mr Rayment said that the airport would be closed for Christmas on 25 and 26 December, which was the usual arrangement.

12.3 Cllr Worrall said that there was inevitably a tendency to assume that all complaints about overflights in the area were by aircraft operating from Farnborough, whereas this was not always the case. It was agreed that it would be best nevertheless for complaints to be directed to the TAG complaints line – 01252 526001 – which could advise whether the aircraft concerned was from Farnborough.

12.4 Mr Marks referred to his letter of 6 November, copies of which he had distributed to members at the meeting: he drew attention to third party risk and insurance. On third party risk, Ms Bartaby said that the discussions with the National Air Traffic Services (NATS) had taken place some three or four years previously and TAG had not sought to return to the issue with NATS since then. The company acknowledged NATS' calculations. It did, however, remain of the view that the crash rate position was likely to be somewhat overstated: as the issue was a safety one, however, there was nothing wrong with that. TAG had received input from a number of advisers over the years and had interrogated various air crash statistics data bases.

12.5 On insurance, Mr Rayment said he had checked the certificates for all 737s operating from Farnborough. Some had \$300m of cover, and some \$1bn. There was some further discussion, from which it emerged that there were no mandatory requirements for aerodromes to set minimum levels of insurance, and that the CAA's insurance requirements applied to operators. Mr Khalek challenged the statement in the letter which said that the risks associated with business aviation were higher than those for scheduled operations. It was agreed that Mr Marks would show Mr Rayment some relevant correspondence in the hope of clarifying the position.

12.6 In answer to a question about responsibility for the Control Tower, Ms Bartaby said that TAG were responsible for it, but the company had contracted its

operation to NATS.

- 12.7 It was suggested by a member of the public that inadequate publicity had been given to the committee's meetings, and that the establishment of a website would assist the process of public consultation. Ms Bartaby said that a notice about the meeting had been placed in the local newspapers. Cllr Scrivens asked that the latter point be included in the agenda for the next meeting. The Chairman said that note will have been taken of these comments, and he was sure that the Secretary would be given appropriate instructions for publicising future meetings. He took the opportunity to draw attention to the fact that the committee's meetings were not public meetings but meetings which the public were invited to attend. **[ACTION: MS BARTABY AND SECRETARY.]**

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 13.1 The committee agreed that its next meeting would be held on Thursday 18 March 2004, at 2.00pm. It also agreed that it would meet on Thursdays 29 July and 18 November 2004, also at 2.00pm.

G E T Green

Secretary, Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee

9 December 2003