



# FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Notes of the Meeting held at 2.00pm on Thursday 25 March 2004 in the BAe Systems Park Centre

Present:

**Chairman:**

Mr R MacKay

**User Representatives:**

Ms A Bartaby	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr R Brodhurst	ARAVCO
Mr N Gibson	TAG Farnborough Ltd
Mr M Khalek	GAMA Aviation (item 4 onwards)
Mr T Thomas	Society of British Aerospace Companies
Mr R Walker	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd

**Local Authority Representatives:**

Cllr Mrs P M Devereux	Hampshire County Council
Cllr R L G Dibbs	Rushmoor Borough Council (item 6 onwards)
Cllr Mrs M Hunt	Waverley Borough Council
Cllr N Lambert	Hart District Council
Cllr Mrs D Moss	Hart District Council
Cllr J Phillips	Surrey County Council
Cllr P G Taylor	Rushmoor Borough Council

**Local Interest Representatives:**

Mrs B Bryant	North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
Mr R Kimble	Farnborough College of Technology
Mrs D Knowles	Mytchett, Frimley Green and Deepcut Society
Mr G Marks	Farnborough Airport Residents' Association
Ms J Radley	Fleet and Crookham Civic Society
Cllr E Worrall	Ash Parish Council

**In attendance:**

Mr M Eddowes	AEA Technology (Aviation), Warrington, Lancashire
--------------	---

**Secretary:**

Mr G E T Green

## **1. WELCOME TO NEW MEMBER**

- 1.1 Opening the meeting, the chairman welcomed Cllr Mrs D Moss, Hart District Council's second representative, to her first meeting of the committee.
- 1.2 The chairman added that, because BAe required the room for another function at 5.00pm, the meeting would need to finish a little before that time.

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr M Drew (Surrey Heath Borough Council), Mr L Rayment (TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd), Cllr V Scrivens (Farnham Town Council), Mr J Batty (Business Aircraft Users' Association), Mr W Epton (Farnborough Operators' and Residents' Committee), Cllr C Hebborn (Crandall Parish Council), and Mr T Sidebottom (Society of British Aerospace Companies). Cllr Taylor gave apologies on behalf of Cllr Dibbs, who would be late as he had been detained at another meeting.
- 2.2 The chairman drew members' attention to the desirability of the organisations which they represented nominating a deputy who might attend in the place of the member when the latter was unavailable. Names and addresses of deputies should be sent to the secretary.

## **3. NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 20 NOVEMBER 2004**

### **3.1 Accuracy**

- 3.1.1 The notes of the meeting held on 20 November 2004 were approved as a true record.

### **3.2 Matters Arising**

- 3.2.1 5.1 Cllr Lambert thanked Kathy Wood for her presentation on LEQ.
- 3.2.2 7.1.2 and 7.1.3. Ms Radley asked whether the information referred to was now available. Mr Walker said he thought that it had been supplied as part of the response to Ms Radley, and she said she would check this.
- 3.2.3 8. Ms Radley expressed the FCCS' gratitude for the discussions with TAG and the chairman since the committee's meeting in November. She asked whether the written replies that had been sent to the FCCS after the November meeting might be attached to the minutes of the current meeting. TAG agreed. **[ACTION: SECRETARY.]**
- 3.2.4 12.5 Mr Marks said he had not pursued this with Mr Rayment. He said he had some sympathy with Mr Khalek's reaction as it might be thought that the NATS statistics implied that operations were falling short of the highest possible standards. Mr Marks did not think this was the case. He thought that the statistics caused the PSZ to be larger at its eastern end than any other UK airport. This was an unenviable position, and he

thought it was for this reason that Rushmoor BC were committed to a reduction in the 1:100,000 risk contour should the crash rate be reduced. He added that the committee were aware that Cllr Taylor had written to TAG. TAG noted that this had been addressed in the minutes of the July 2003 meeting.

#### **4. THE PUBLIC SAFETY ZONE (PSZ)**

4.1 Mr M Eddowes of AEA Technology gave a presentation about the public safety zone, which included an outline of the history of, and reasons for, the introduction and development of PSZ policy. Mr Eddowes said that the present arrangements were risk-based and took account crucially of the concept of “limit of tolerability”, under which only exceedingly low risks were acceptable. The slides used during the presentation are attached to these minutes.

4.2 It was recognised that some of the issues raised in the questions listed under agenda item 3 had been addressed during the presentation, but during the discussion that followed it, the following points relating to the questions emerged:

4.2.1 Ms Bartaby said, in answer to the question from Cllr Mrs Moss at 3.1 (b) on the agenda, that the PSZ at Farnborough was sufficient to cope with the increase in air traffic covered by TAG’s current planning permission.

4.2.2 On question 3.2 (a), Mr Eddowes pointed out that NATS considered the PSZ model to be their commercial property. While a version had been made public originally, they seemed now to be more reticent. It was, however, understood that changes had been made in the light of the most recent accidents data and of new and improved methods of calculation. While it was recognised that NATS would not reveal confidential information, it was agreed that TAG should write on behalf of the committee, seeking more information about the changes to the PSZ.  
**[ACTION: TAG.]**

4.2.3 On question 3.2 (b), Mr Eddowes said that the incidence of accidents on take-off was about half of that on landing, and that most landing incidents were on or very near the airfield concerned. Ms Radley, referring also to question 3.2 (c), said she would like further information as it appeared that the impact of accidents on take-offs was greater. Mr Eddowes said that the process of taking off was more straightforward than that of landing, when a much greater range of factors came into play. Mr Marks referred to the inclusion of a “crash consequence” element in the PSZ model, and wondered whether this varied for each aircraft. Mr Eddowes commented that the evidence suggested that, in terms of their consequences, there appeared not to be a significant difference between incidents on landing or take-off.

4.2.4 On question 3.2 (e), Ms Bartaby said that the direction of take-off was crucially a decision for the pilot in every case, taking account of guidance from air traffic control and all the relevant circumstances.

4.3 The chairman thanked Mr Eddowes for his presentation, which he was sure the

committee's members had found interesting and helpful. He drew members' attention to the explanatory note which Rushmoor BC had produced about the PSZ. He added that TAG had undertaken to write to NATS for further information about the changes to the PSZ and, when NATS' reply had been received, the issue could be considered further.

## **5. AIRPORTS WHITE PAPER**

- 5.1 Ms Bartaby drew attention to Paper A, which was an extract from the government's White Paper "The Future of Air Transport". This was the only page of the White Paper in which a reference to Farnborough had been made. She also referred to page 141 of the White Paper, copies of which were distributed to members as Mr Marks had given notice of a question about airport master plans.
- 5.2 Dealing with Mr Marks' question (4.1 on the agenda), Ms Bartaby said that guidance was expected from the government in April about their requirements in relation to the master plans. TAG would respond appropriately. She pointed out that the White Paper had focused on the UK's major airports, which explained why there was just a single reference to Farnborough. She added that the main concern that the government appeared to have in asking for indicative land use plans from 2016 to 2030 was that they needed to consider surface access, which required to be planned over this period of time. TAG would, however, await the further guidance from the government, and then respond to it.

## **6. NEW GUIDELINES FOR CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES**

- 6.1 The DfT had published revised guidelines for airport consultative committees in December 2003, and copies had been sent to members of the committee at that time.
- 6.2 The following points emerged during the discussion:
- i. Mr Marks said that the committee had drafted a good constitution, and he saw no need to revise it in the light of the DfT's recent guidelines. He drew attention to the examples of good practice in representation on page 4 of the guidelines, and to what the document said about the appointment of an independent chairman: this was endorsed by the committee. Referring to paragraph 6.6 of the guidelines, Mr Marks thought that the circumstances at Farnborough fully justified the inclusion of airport officers on the committee.
  - ii. Ms Radley referred to the examples of good practice in providing technical advice on page 5 of the guidelines, and said that a request had been made earlier for committee members to visit the airport for a familiarisation tour. The chairman said he was sure that TAG will have noted the request. **[ACTION: TAG.]**

## **7. WEBSITE FOR THE COMMITTEE**

- 7.1 Ms Bartaby said that TAG had given some preliminary consideration to a website, and it was clear that the establishment of one would need much thought and require a minimum level of resource. She proposed that a working group be set up and

invited volunteers to join TAG representatives. Cllr Lambert, Mr Marks and Ms Radley said they would be pleased to join the working group. The aim would be to report to the next meeting of the committee. **[ACTION: TAG AND WORKING PARTY.]**

## **8. STANDARD INFORMATION REPORT**

- 8.1 Ms Bartaby introduced the latest TAG Information Report, which had been attached to the agenda as Paper B. She drew attention to the main points. She emphasised that the flight training, referred to in paragraph 5.3 of the report, would be on ground-based simulators. It was hoped that the new facility would be in operation in about one year, and an opportunity will be taken to show committee members round it.
- 8.2 On paragraph 5.4, Ms Bartaby said that the BAE reception lounge had been relocated outside the civil enclave. The chairman pointed out, for the benefit of members of the public, that the shuttle service referred to was an air shuttle. Mrs Bartaby also drew attention to paragraph 6.3 of the report. The Southampton Airport consultative committee was quite a small one, and its meetings appeared to be shorter than Farnborough's. It considered much the same range of issues as at Farnborough; but, unlike Farnborough's, its meetings were not open to the public.
- 8.3 Dealing with the questions of which Mr Marks had given notice, at 7.1 of the agenda, Ms Bartaby said that TAG had been monitoring the use of reverse thrust (RT), in view of the suggestions of unnecessary use. The latest survey showed that it was used in about 46% of landings. She said that pilots used RT when they judged it to be necessary and taking account of their operating instructions and manuals.
- 8.4 On the question at 7.1 (b), TAG confirmed that the certificated landing performance of Gulfstream aircraft included reverse thrust. Mr Khalek pointed out that, when the CAA approved an aircraft's performance, it did so without taking account of the effect of RT. Many manufacturers recommended the use of RT, but at the discretion of the pilot, who would need to take account of all the relevant circumstances. The committee was told that noise contours did take account of RT.
- 8.5 On question 7.1 (c), Mr Walker said he would seek to establish what information was available about landing distances without using RT. **[ACTION: MR WALKER.]**
- 8.6 In answer to question 7.1 (d), the committee was informed that most new aircraft had carbon brakes, and that RT was a costly option to use. It was emphasised that RT was used only where safety considerations called for it.
- 8.7 In further discussion, Cllr Dibbs, supported by Cllr Phillips, said that the technical aspects that had been discussed were relatively unimportant: the real question was whether the use of RT constituted a nuisance for local residents. As a local resident, he did not consider this to be the case.
- 8.8 Cllr Taylor asked whether, in future reports, the table of aircraft movements could

distinguish between weekday and week-end movements. Ms Radley asked whether the full year figures for 2003 could be provided as those given to the committee's November 2003 meeting had not covered the whole of 2003. She also asked if a little more information could be given in future in the table of complaints, especially about the dates of incidents that led to complaints and the response that was given. Mrs Bartaby said that these requests could be met.

**[ACTION: MS BARTABY.]**

- 8.9 Ms Radley referred to paragraph 6.4 of the report and asked where the portable noise monitors were. It was agreed that these details should be included in the minutes. TAG have provided the following information about the three locations:

(a) two permanent monitors are at Farnborough College of Technology and Tweseldown Racecourse;

(b) the mobile monitor has been at Hilder Gardens but is about to be moved to 52 Tweseldown Road, Church Crookham.

- 8.10 Mr Brodhurst, referring to paragraph 5.3 of the report, asked whether the new flight training simulators would relate only to business aircraft, and Ms Bartaby confirmed this. He also asked whether TAG would be responsible for security now that the BAE Systems' reception building had been relocated outside the civil enclave. Mr Walker said that TAG had responsibility for site security. The issue of whether BAE staff would have to be screened was under consideration, but BAE had, in any case, installed an arch and appropriate screening equipment. Ms Radley said a member of the public had asked about general site security, and Mr Walker said he would supply further information on this.

**[ACTION: MR WALKER.]**

- 8.11 Cllr Mrs Devereux expressed her thanks to TAG for the talk to the Townswomen's Guild on 8 January, which had been much enjoyed.

## **9. MATTERS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA**

- 9.1 Ms Radley (Fleet and Crookham Civic Society) had given notice of the questions shown at 8.1 on the agenda.

In response to the question at 8.1 (a), Mr Walker said that there was a CAT 1 ILS at Farnborough, and all pilots should adhere to the extended centre line. There was, however, some permitted tolerance and in some circumstances, this had to be used by pilots. The centre line was there for a purpose, and pilots were under an obligation to observe it in normal circumstances. It would be inappropriate to ask pilots to deviate from it routinely on account of particular buildings in the area. In answer to Cllr Worrall's enquiry, Mr Eddowes said that he thought that, in view of the extremely low level of risk, LEAs would judge that they had better causes on which to spend their money than on reinforcing school buildings and their grounds to protect against an incident involving an aircraft.

- 9.2 On the questions at 8.1 (b) and 8.3, Ms Bartaby said that the noise contours were being prepared. There were no problems, but the work was complex and

time-consuming; and it was important that the information should be correct. The information should be available at an earlier stage in future years. It would include data which would enable predictions to be made of the noise consequences of the increase in flight movements to 28,000. It was intended that this subject should be on the agenda for the next meeting.

- 9.3 On question 8.1 (c), Mr Walker said that air traffic control advised of the surface wind and its direction. There was a slight preference for runway 24 (ie, westerly), but the decision was for the pilot to make. A pilot would not land in a tail wind which exceeded 10 knots (and in most circumstances considerably less). Pilots would take into account the flight manual for the aircraft concerned, and it was recognised that landing into the wind was always the safer option.
- 9.4 Mr Marks said that the material shown at 8.2 of the agenda was his attempt to summarise the position as he understood it on the basis of information that he had been given by the CAA and the DfT.

During the discussion, the following points emerged:

- i. Mrs Bartaby said there was no dispute with the figures. The new EU legislation would be adhered to. As regards external incidents, she had checked with TAG's insurance underwriters and been told that TAG would have no insurable interest outside the airport. She would, however, be interested to receive any information that Mr Marks had been given. It was agreed that he would pass to TAG the names of his contacts in the CAA and the DfT. **[ACTION: MR MARKS.]**
- ii. On Mr Marks' point (b), Mr Khalek said that the fact that insurance tended to relate to within-airport incidents did not necessarily indicate that the cover was restricted. It was more that the cover related to a worst case position because the cost of damage was likely to be higher than in an off-site incident. Also, it was possible to estimate the costs of an on-site incident, and therefore the cover required, more accurately than for an off-site incident. Mr Khalek also assured the committee that aircraft operators had to provide insurance levels as specified by the CAA.

## **10. FARNBOROUGH AIRSHOW 2004 - UPDATE**

- 10.1 Mr Thomas said that building had started on the exhibition halls and corporate hospitality accommodation. Within about six weeks of the show, more information about the aircraft to be exhibited will be available. All exhibition space had been sold; as had about 85% of the corporate hospitality suites.

## **11. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN**

- 11.1 The chairman reminded the committee that he had agreed to take on the chairmanship of the committee on a trial basis for three meetings. This was the third meeting, so it was appropriate that members should give further consideration to the chairmanship. The chairman said that, if it were the committee's wish, he would be happy to continue to chair it. Given this, he acknowledged that he had an interest in this agenda item. If it were the

committee's wish, he would vacate the chair in favour of another member for this item. Members agreed that Mr MacKay should remain in the chair for this item.

- 11.2 Members agreed that they would be very happy for Mr MacKay to continue to chair the committee, and that, in line with paragraph 5.1 of the DfT's guidelines for consultative committees issued in December 2003, the new appointment should be for three years. In accordance with section 8 of the committee's constitution, it would be for TAG formally to reappoint Mr MacKay. **[ACTION: MS BARTABY.]**

## **12. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

- 12.1 Members of the public asked questions about (i) the survey of the use of RT; (ii) the background to the claim (see slide no. 10) that the PSZ model was cautious by a factor of 10 when applied to Farnborough; (iii) how, given that the ILS related only to landing, pilots were regulated on take-off; and (iv) whether there should be a requirement that all landing aircraft should proceed to the end of the runway, whether or not reverse thrust had been used.
- 12.2 On 12.1 (i) above, Mr Walker said that the survey of the use of RT had been undertaken throughout February 2004, and the precise outcome which had emerged was that it was used on 46% of landings. On 12.1 (ii) above, Mr Eddowes said that the main factors in assessing risk were frequency of accidents, their consequences, and their location. The main feature was frequency, and a fairly accurate picture of this could be formed: Farnborough emerged well from this. The other factors were less easy to analyse and assess. It had to be borne in mind that the NATS model was a generic one, which applied across the country. He was fully satisfied that, taking account of the relevant circumstances as they applied to Farnborough, the risk there was lower by a factor of 10 when compared with the national model.
- 12.3 On the question at 12.1 (iii), Mr Walker confirmed that the ILS was used only for landings. He pointed out that the airspace around Farnborough was also involved with coordinating movements from other sites around. The practice was for noise abatement procedures to be observed for 2.5 miles, but air traffic control might sometimes require pilots to depart from these, eg, by making an earlier turn, for safety reasons. On 12.1 (iv), Mr Walker thought there would be practical difficulties if all aircraft, irrespective of the distance that they needed to stop, were required to proceed to the end of the runway; and there was no obvious benefit from imposing such a requirement.

## **13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 13.1 The Chairman drew members' attention to Paper C on the agenda, which was a letter from Mr M J Webster of Farnham, in which he asked whether the committee could hold its meetings in the evenings.
- 13.2 Members recognised that no one time would be convenient for everybody. In discussion, they noted that their meetings were of the committee (to which they were pleased to admit the public), but were not public meetings. It was therefore appropriate for them to consider how a change of meeting time would affect



- them. Members considered a number of factors. These included the fact that some members, especially those who were councillors, attended other meetings in the evenings; that going to evening meetings might be less attractive to some members of the public than daytime meetings; that committee members were intended to be representative of the organisations to which they belonged, and were accessible to anybody who wished to raise a matter but was unable to attend a meeting; that meeting dates were agreed well in advance (and that these would be included on the website when it had been set up).
- 13.3 Against this background, members concluded that they would continue to meet in the afternoons but hoped that as many members as possible of the interested public would be able to attend their meetings.
- 13.4 There was a brief further discussion about noise contours and monitoring , but it was recognised that these issues could be raised at the committee's next meeting when noise contours would be on the agenda. **[ACTION: SECRETARY.]**
- 13.5 Mr Marks referred back to the discussion about the risk being considerably lower at Farnborough than nationally, and observed that in principle this might suggest that the PSZ at Farnborough could be reduced. Cllr Taylor suggested, as he had done at the July 2003 meeting, that any change should be for the benefit of the local community rather than that the current contour be used to accommodate an increased number of aircraft movements.
- 13.6 The chairman expressed thanks on behalf of the committee to BAE for the use of their accommodation and facilities.
- 14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**
- 14.1 The committee agreed that its next meeting would be held on Thursday 29 July 2004, at 2.00pm. It also agreed that the next following meeting would be held on Thursday 18 November 2004, also at 2.00pm.

G E T Green  
Secretary, Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee

9 April 2004