



FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting to be held at 2.00pm on Thursday 25 March 2004 in the Bae Systems Park Centre

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Notes of the Meeting held on Thursday 20 November 2003.

The notes were circulated under cover of the secretary's letter of 9 December 2003, and *members are asked to bring their copy with them to the meeting.*

2.1 Accuracy

2.2 Matters Arising

3. The Public Safety Zone

An oral presentation will be made by Mr Mark Eddowes of AEA Technology.

3.1 Cllr Mrs Moss (Hart District Council) has given notice of the following questions:

In view of the published PSZ would committee members confirm that:

(a) they are satisfied with the given co-ordinates from DfT that reduce the PSZ at the Church Crookham end, which has up to 70 per cent of take-offs from the aerodrome, which we all know is the most dangerous time for a plane: and

(b) that this PSZ is sufficient to cope with the increase in air traffic covered by TAG's current planning permission.

3.2 Mrs Radley (Fleet and Crookham Civic Society (FCCS) has given notice of the following questions:

(a) Following the publication of the confirmed PSZ for Farnborough Aerodrome on 9 January this year, can a full explanation be given of the changes from the proxy to the confirmed zone? FCCS are confused why the PSZ should expand at the eastern edge of the runway by over 200m, yet the PSZ at the western end should shrink by 150m. Why should this be? Is it a change in the model or the data? Why should the western end not be affected in the same way as the eastern end?

(b) FCCS are aware that the calculation of the PSZ is a detailed process, but were of the opinion that the consequences of an incident on take-off were of greater importance than the landings. We understand that westerly take-offs outnumber easterly ones, yet appear to have a lesser effect on the PSZ. Why should this be?

(c) FCCS appreciate that the majority of take-offs will occur in the westerly direction, also that the consequences of an air crash, and to some extent the probability of an air crash, are greater for take-offs than for landings. Yet it does not seem to be reflected in this confirmed PSZ.

(d) FCCS understand the limits to flight movements predicted for the constraints

at the eastern end of the runway, but is it possible for asymmetrical use of the aerodrome to allow for more flights to and from the western end of the runway? If so, how could this affect the PSZ?

4. Airports White Paper

4.1 Mr Marks (FARA) has given notice of the following observation and question: Section 12 (paragraphs 12.7 to 12.9) of the White Paper covers airport master plans, which are to be produced by airport operators as soon as possible so that they may inform the local development framework. A master plan should set out proposals for the development of the airport to 2015 in some detail. Indicative land use plans are to be included for the period from 2016 to 2030. As section 10 of the White Paper concludes that Farnborough “had potential to provide additional capacity for business aviation demand”, do TAG consider that this requirement applies in their case? If so, will their master plan be submitted to Rushmoor Borough Council?

5. New Guidelines for Consultative Committees

The guidelines were sent to committee members on 22 December 2003, *and members are asked to bring their copy with them to the meeting.*

6. Website for the Committee

7. Standard Information Report

7.1 Mr Marks (FARA) has given notice of the following questions about the use of reverse thrust:

- a) Can an assurance be given that brake wear is not being unreasonably minimised at the expense of increased noise nuisance suffered by residents? Answers to the following questions might help to establish whether or not this is the case.
- b) Is landing performance certificated in the absence of RT?
- c) For each of the aircraft types that use Farnborough on a regular basis, Will TAG provide the certified landing distances, with and without the use of RT under dry runway conditions for a typical landing weight and mean air temperature.
- d) It is understood that carbon brakes do not wear in the same way as steel discs and are efficient only when hot. Unlike aircraft fitted with steel brakes, heavy braking of aircraft fitted with carbon brakes is not a disadvantage and could be an advantage if efficiency increases with temperature. TAG are asked to say what aircraft types using Farnborough on a regular basis are fitted with carbon brakes.

8. Matters Raised by Members of the Committee on issues that are not on the Agenda.

8.1 Mrs Radley (FCCS) has given notice of the following questions:

- a) FCCS are very grateful for the information and charts of the ILS Provided by TAG for the aircraft landings at Farnborough. It is clear from the charts that the approach envelope covers a fairly wide area overflying residential areas of Church Crookham and Fleet. In particular, this includes a local infant and junior school in Church Crookham. Notwithstanding the rules relating to societal risk areas (1in1⁶ contour), would it not be pertinent for the pilots who fly into this airport to be aware of these sites and, where possible, to avoid overflying these schools?
- c) FCCS very much look forward to the publication of the new noise contour charts for Farnborough Aerodrome. The society are also very grateful for the relocation of the mobile noise monitor within residential Church Crookham, to establish the official noise levels as experienced by residents there. May we ask

for the newly published figures and charts to be published as soon as possible please? It would be very useful to have these so that the local authorities can start to take note of the impact upon local residents and in particular in relation to PPG 24. May we also be given some guidance as to the foreseen noise impact from the predicated increase in flight movements over the next few years to the 28,000-flight movement limit?

c) Following observations of flights in and out of a given runway within a relatively short space of time, may we ask what is the maximum tail wind in which operators, (both airfield and aircraft) are permitted to (i) take off; and (ii) land?

8.2 Mr Marks (FARA) has given notice of the following questions and observations about insurance:

a) Mr Rayment is recorded as saying at the last meeting (paragraph 12.5 of the notes) that in the case of the 737s some had \$300m insurance and some \$1bn. I do not wish to take up the Committee's time on this, but Mr Rayment or other members of the committee may wish to comment on the following salient points arising from a brief discussion with Mr Rayment and rather more detailed discussions with CAA and the DfT. (I will be glad to be corrected if I have it wrong.)

b) Insurance levels are based upon an incident contained within the airport boundary and involving a wide-bodied jet.

c) The CAA have two domestic classifications (I.e. for UK based aircraft) - Type A for 20 seats and above; and Type B , air taxi industry, 19 seats or fewer. For Type A, levels range from £75m to £400m. For Type B, levels range from £3m to £60m. These sums cover passengers and third parties.

d) The CAA are aware that not all Companies in the air taxi industry have the resources to fund appropriate levels of insurance.

e) The minimum levels specified for onshore aircraft are generally higher than those specified by other national authorities for offshore aircraft. For aircraft based offshore, unless engaged in public transport, third party insurance cover is not a requirement under UK law. Only 25% of the aircraft using Farnborough are based onshore.

f) New EU legislation will come into effect in 2005/2006. This will require offshore based aircraft to carry insurance to at least current UK levels. The new requirement will have 10 bands of third party insurance ranging from £0.5m for gliders to £600m for an A380. It is understood that executive jets will probably be lumped together into a £69m band irrespective of weight, except for those aircraft types that are also classified as airliners. In these cases, the insurance levels will be those specified for holders of Type A licences.

g) Although insurance levels are based upon 'on airport' incident scenarios, some airport operators have a precondition requiring aircraft owners/operators to carry additional third party insurance that reflect risks outside the airport.

8.3 Mr Marks has given notice of the following questions about noise contours:

Technical difficulties have delayed the production of the revised noise contours, and it is understood that these will not be available until the end of March. Can TAG say what the difficulties were and provide a progress report?

9. Farnborough Air show 2004 - update

10. Appointment of Chairman

At the meeting on 17 July 2003 it was proposed, and agreed by the committee, that Mr MacKay be appointed as Chairman on a trial basis for three meetings. This is the third meeting, and members may wish to consider the future

chairmanship of the committee.

Under the committee's constitution (section 8), the Chairman shall be appointed by TAG Farnborough Airport, following consultation, and with the agreement of, representatives of the three sectional interests.

11. Questions from the Members of the Public.

A period of fifteen minutes is provided for members of the public to ask questions Levant to the committee's responsibilities.

12. Any Other Business

12.1 To consider the time at which committee meetings should start. A letter from Mr M J Webster is attached.

13. Date of Next Meeting

At its meeting on 20 November 2003, the committee agreed that the next meeting would be held on Thursday 29 July 2004.

Members will wish to confirm this date, and they may wish to agree that the following meeting in November 2004.