



FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Draft Notes of the Meeting held at 2.00pm on Thursday 18 November 2004 in the BAe Systems Park Centre

Present:

Chairman:

Mr R MacKay

User Representatives:

Ms A Bartaby	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr W Epton	Farnborough Operators' and Residents' Committee
Mr M Khalek	GAMA Aviation
Mr L Rayment	TAG Farnborough Ltd
Mr R Walker	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr C Way	Society of British Aerospace Companies

Local Authority Representatives:

Cllr Mr J Starling	Rushmoor Borough Council
Cllr Mrs P M Devereux	Hampshire County Council
Cllr R L G Dibbs	Rushmoor Borough Council
Cllr P Hutcheson	Hart District Council
Cllr P B Isherwood	Waverley Borough Council
Cllr N Lambert	Hart District Council
Cllr J Phillips	Surrey County Council
Cllr D Whitcroft	Surrey Heath Borough Council

Local Interest Representatives:

Mr G Marks	Farnborough Airport Residents' Association
Ms J Radley	Fleet and Crookham Civic Society
Cllr V Scrivens	Farnham Town Council

In attendance:

Mr A Bristol	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Ms K Wood	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd

Secretary:

Mr G E T Green

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Mrs Hunt (Waverley Borough Council), Mr J Harrocks (NHCCI), Cllr M Drew (Surrey Heath Borough Council), Mr R Brodhurst (ARAVCO), Cllr P Taylor (Rushmoor Borough Council), Mrs D Knowles (Mytchett, Frimley Green and Deepcut Society), Mr R Kimble (Farnborough College of Technology), Mr J Batty (Business Aircraft Users' Association), Mr T Sidebottom (SBAC), and Cllr E Worrall (Ash Parish Council).

2. MEMBERSHIP

- 2.1 The Chairman said he knew that the committee would want to join him in expressing sadness at the death of Lt Col R Osborne, who had been appointed in May as the Fleet and Crookham Civic Society's (FCCS) representative on the committee, and would wish to convey their sympathy to Col. Osborne's family.
- 2.2 The Chairman said that the FCCS had appointed Ms J Radley as their representative. She had been the society's representative until May, when she was elected to Hart District Council, and, on behalf of the committee, Mr MacKay welcomed her return. He also welcomed Cllr Isherwood (Waverley Borough Council) who was attending in the absence of Cllr Mrs Hunt, Cllr Starling (Rushmoor Borough Council), attending in the place of Cllr Taylor, Cllr Whitcroft, (Surrey Heath Borough Council) attending in the place of Cllr Drew, and Mr Way (SBAC) attending in the absence of Mr Sidebottom.

3. NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 29 JULY 2004

3.1 Accuracy

- 3.1.1 The notes of the meeting held on 29 July 2004 were approved as a true record, subject to the following:

paragraph 7.5: in the penultimate line, "52.5" should read "42.5"; and
paragraph 10.1: in the penultimate line, "£17bn" should read "£17m".

3.2 Matters Arising

- 3.2.1 3.2.1 Mr Marks said he had had a very helpful discussion with Mr Walker, and he was now satisfied with the use of RT. The three main points which had emerged, on which he and Mr Walker agreed, were that (i) the majority of aircraft did not need to use RT under dry conditions; (ii) Mr Walker sought explanations in cases in which it appeared that RT had been used unnecessarily; and (iii) as pilots became more familiar with the aerodrome, they needed to use RT less frequently.
- 3.2.2 3.2.5 The Chairman said that Mr Lloyd, Chief Executive of Rushmoor Borough Council, had written to members on 11 November about risk assessment in the context of the council's planning approval for the aerodrome. Mr Marks said that he thought there were still matters which need to be addressed and drew attention to his letter of 17 November, copies of which had been circulated at the meeting. (A slightly amended

version is attached to these notes.)

- 3.2.3 7.4 Ms Bartaby said that this case was one of the two referred to in paragraph 4.3 of the TAG Information Report at agenda item 6. She would copy to Cllr Starling the written apology which had been received. In discussion, she said that the case was airport-specific and did not raise regulatory issues. The airport's procedures had been made clear to the operator: in the unlikely event of the incident being repeated, the operator could be banned from using Farnborough.

[ACTION: MS BARTABY.]

- 3.2.4 7.5 Mr Marks asked whether the ILS service had been subject to sudden or gradual degradations. Mr Walker said that, on almost all of the occasions, the system had been out of service for less than one hour. He said that there was an ILS at each end of the runways, and on some occasions, it was the system which was not being used which failed.

- 3.2.5 9. The Chairman drew members' attention to Mr Lloyd's letter of 11 November and Mr Marks' response of 17 November. Mr Marks said there was too much for members to absorb at the meeting, as complex issues were involved. It would be better, as suggested in his letter, if he were afforded the opportunity to take forward his concerns with Rushmoor Borough Council's Planning Department. After some discussion, it was noted that Mr Marks would do this in his capacity as a member of the public.

[ACTION: MR MARKS.]

- 3.2.6 Mr Kirby, a member of Rushmoor Borough Council, speaking as a member of the public, said that the committee, when considering Mr Marks' paper at its last meeting, had been invited, but had declined, to refer the issues to Rushmoor Borough Council and the Department for Transport. Now that a letter had been received from the council's Chief Executive, there was a further opportunity to approach the council.

On a point of order, Cllr Phillips asked whether members of the public were allowed to participate in each agenda item. The Chairman said that he wished to try to establish a balance among the competing interests. There was an agenda item – number 8 - under which members of the public could ask questions, but he would wish to use his discretion if, at other times during debate, it appeared to him to be appropriate and helpful for members of the public to be heard. Cllr Scrivens said that, although he did not agree that members of the public should be permitted to intervene in each agenda item, he noted that some councils now permitted the public to be given an opportunity to speak at an early stage in a meeting. This ensured that the council or body concerned could then consider the agenda items in the light of any views that had been expressed by the public. Cllr Dibbs said that the Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee was more accessible to the public than many others. He suggested that the members of the public might convene,

perhaps 30 minutes before the consultative committee met, to discuss issues with TAG. The Chairman referred to a letter from an officer in the Planning Department of Surrey County Council, which said that, of the five consultative committees, including Heathrow's and Gatwick's, for which the officer provided support to the council's designated members, only FACC permitted public involvement at its meetings. Ms Radley pointed out that Farnborough had probably the highest population in the vicinity of any airport. Cllr Lambert suggested that a further review of the constitution might be undertaken, which would provide the opportunity for the committee to come to agreed conclusions on these matters. The Chairman said that note had been taken of the views that had been expressed. As he had indicated earlier in the meeting, he wished to do his best to strike a fair balance among the different interests.

- 3.2.7 11.3 Mr Marks made two points. He asked whether the level of accuracy was constant, irrespective of distance from the runway threshold. Secondly, he assumed that the B and K monitoring system took its data from radar. In which case, did this mean that radar recorded the data to the nearest 100ft or was that the level of discrimination provided in the B and K system? Ms Bartaby said she would arrange for a written reply to be sent to Mr Marks.

[ACTION: MS BARTABY.]

4. AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

- 4.1 Mr Alex Bristol, Air Traffic Manager, gave a presentation on air traffic control.
- 4.2 The following points were among those to emerge after the presentation:
- i. there was a legal requirement to keep RT transcripts for 30 days, but; in practice, most transcripts were kept for 45 days;
 - ii. there were relatively few visual approaches, which had to be made above the 3.5 degree glide path;
 - iii. even with an ILS approach, the last 200 feet were visual;
 - iv. it was noted that a number of aircraft landing on runway 24 had joined the extended centre line later than if complying with the ILS. As the AIP said that ILS approaches should be the norm, it was assumed that visual approaches had been authorised in such cases;
 - v. it was confirmed that the default arrangement, laid down in the AIP, was for ILS landings. But, to ease air traffic congestion, avoid or reduce delay, or to take account of other ATC-relevant circumstances, a visual approach would be sanctioned;
 - vi. it was important to avoid making a general assumption that ILS was good, and visual bad. ILS was very effective in bad weather and in regulating heavy traffic. But either method was effective and safe if the correct

procedures were followed. It was, however, recognised that the AIP was designed to balance the needs of operators and the environmental considerations;

- vii ILS was not affected by the topography of the area;
- viii there was very close cooperation between the ATC functions at Farnborough and RAF Odiham.

4.3 The Chairman thanked Mr Bristol for his interesting and informative presentation.

5. COMMITTEE WEBSITE

5.1 Cllr Lambert said that the working group, comprising himself, Mr Marks, Ms Moss (the Fleet and Crookham Civic Society's reserve representative), and Ms Bartaby, had made good progress and agreed on the way forward. He expressed his thanks to the other members of the group.

5.2 He proposed that the committee should have its own website, independent of TAG's. Cllr Lambert's presentation outlined the structure of the proposed website, its scope, and possible links to other websites. He said that the website had been trialed for a week among the members of the working group. He invited the committee to agree that:

- i. it should provide funds (about £75.00) to buy a suitable address. facc.co.uk and facc.org were currently available;
- ii. the committee should provide funds for the ongoing costs, which were estimated at about £4.50 per month;
- iii. an editorial committee be established, and that this should comprise the existing working group (including TAG);
- iv. the proposed website should go live no later than the end of January 2005, and that, in the meantime, it should go live to members.

5.3 Ms Bartaby said TAG had considered how the proposed website should relate to the existing TAG one. She thought it was a good solution for the committee to have its own site. TAG would create a community section on its website, and this could include material relevant to the committee if that was considered helpful.

5.4 Cllr Scrivens said that it was very desirable that, as planned, the website should include pictures of aircraft: this might generate interest among young people. Links to other sites was also important, especially to other consultative committees, local councils and the South-East Regional Assembly.

5.5 The Chairman thanked Cllr Lambert and the working group for their work. Ms

Bartaby said that TAG would be pleased to find the funds required in paragraph 5.2 ii above, and the committee endorsed the proposals in paragraph 5.2.

[ACTION: CLLR LAMBERT AND MS BARTABY]

6. NOISE CONTOURS

6.1 Ms Kathy Wood, Environment Manager, TAG, updated members on noise contours.

6.2 The following points emerged during and following the presentation and in answer to the questions on the agenda from Ms Radley:

- i. as stated in the TAG Information Report, at agenda item 6, the contours for the period from July to December 2003, and the predictive contours for 18,000 aircraft movements for 2004, were submitted to Rushmoor Borough and Hart District Councils in September 2004;
- ii. the contours for the period from January to July 2004, and predictive contours for the period from July to December 2004, were sent to the two councils earlier in the week;
- iii. Ms Radley said she would have a word, outside the committee, with Ms Wood to discuss a few features of the contours;

[ACTION: MS RADLEY.]

- iv. the contours would be put on the proposed website;

[ACTION: WEBSITE WORKING GROUP.]

- v. Ms Wood said she would try to obtain the information asked for in Ms Radley's question i.c;

[ACTION: MS WOOD.]

- vi. In answer to Ms Radley's question ii on the agenda, Mr Bristol said that "frequently" was probably once a day on average. Whether or not noise abatement procedures could be set aside would depend on the circumstances, and would occur only for air traffic-related reasons, eg if an aircraft was in a tight slot, or if other aircraft were backing up. All such occasions were logged. Mr Bristol explained that the significance of "slot" was that, in controlled airspace, an aircraft was, on the basis of its scheduled take-off time, provided with space all along its route, which in almost all cases would involve space controlled by several air traffic authorities. If the take-off time were missed, even by only a few minutes, it was likely that a new flight plan would have to be filed and that a delay of some hours might be caused. Cllr Scrivens suggested that the log to which Mr Bristol had referred should be made available to the committee, and the Chairman said that this would provide reassurance to the public. Mr Bristol said that the document itself was a Restricted one, but there

was no reason why the committee should not be briefed on it.

- 6.3 Cllr Lambert said he was concerned about the practice of submitting questions which related to specific agenda items and which were included under the relevant item in the agenda. If all members did this, the agenda would be unmanageably long. Cllr Dibbs agreed, pointing out that most of the questions submitted could be asked and answered by telephone. Ms Radley observed that the agenda for a meeting was issued only a week beforehand, whereas the deadline for submitting questions was ten days in advance of the meeting, so at that point members did not know the agenda. The Chairman said he noted what had been said and would consider the points carefully.

[ACTION: CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARY.]

- 6.4 The Chairman thanked Ms Wood for her interesting and informative update.

7. TAG INFORMATION REPORT

- 7.1 Ms Bartaby drew members' attention to the main points in the report and, in the course of this, addressed the questions on the agenda in Ms Radley's name. She said that the report included detail relating to aircraft weight and week-end movements; and future reports would include a map showing the three noise monitoring sites and information about the runways used.

[ACTION: MS BARTABY.]

- 7.2 Ms Radley said she was grateful for the answers to her questions and looked forward to seeing the information for which she had asked in future reports. She would contact Ms Wood, as necessary, for any further detail.
- 7.3 In answer to a question from Mr Marks, Mr Rayment said that week-end aircraft movements were subject to a rigorous level of control.

8. MATTERS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ISSUES THAT ARE NOT ON THE AGENDA

- 8.1 In answer to Ms J Radley's question asking whether or not the Department for Transport had formally published the PSZ which had been proposed by NATS earlier in the year, Ms Bartaby said that TAG had not seen any such publication.
- 8.2 In answer to Ms Radley's question ii., Ms Bartaby drew attention to the discussion at the committee's July meeting, recorded in section 4 of the notes of that meeting. Ms Radley asked whether NATS could be pressed further. Ms Bartaby said that TAG could not approach NATS direct, but had to act via the DfT, which had been pressed. She was doubtful whether any further approaches would be fruitful as there was evidently a view within the DfT that the concerns were not substantiated by the facts. Cllr Lambert added that approaches had also been made from Hart District Council.
- 8.3 In answer to Ms Radley's question iii., Ms Bartaby said that it was always TAG's intention to deal with enquiries on the day on which they were received. In this

respect, there had been no change in either the priority accorded to this function or the process. TAG were concerned to maintain their good reputation for dealing with enquiries. In response, Ms Radley said that she would pursue three outstanding issues outside the committee.

[ACTION: MS RADLEY.]

- 8.4 In answer to Mr Marks question i. on the agenda, Cllr Dibbs said that no decisions had yet been made on how the revenue generated by the air movements levy might be spent. Ms Bartaby enquired whether the interest accruing since January 2004 would be credited to the Environment Fund. Cllr Dibbs, recognising that this was not formally a matter for him, said he was sure that it would be.
- 8.5 In answer to a suggestion that the costs of the proposed website might be a proper call on the levy, Cllr Dibbs said that the funds had to be spent on environmental enhancement projects around the airfield, ie, measures to address the environmental effects of the operations at the airfield, and this precluded spending any of the levy money on the website. In response to further interest expressed by the committee, Cllr Dibbs said that Rushmoor Borough Council hoped that the levy money could be spent on substantial projects, of clear benefit to the community, rather than on a range of minor measures. Decisions on expenditure would be made following consultation, including with other local authorities. Mr Marks suggested that it would be open to the committee to put forward ideas to Rushmoor Borough Council.
- 8.6 In answer to Mr Marks question ii., Ms Bartaby said that the MOD no longer had any responsibility for the airfield, which was now a civil one.

9. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- 9.1 Mr Kirby asked whether, bearing in mind that it had been considered appropriate for the committee to have a separate website from TAG's, it was right for TAG to pay for the committee's website. Cllr Lambert said that TAG would have an input to the committee's website and remained part of the small group which was taking the project forward. Mr Marks said that the website should take account of the tripartite nature of the committee and all the parties represented on it – users; local authorities; and local interests. He regretted that the aircraft movements levy could not apparently be used to pay for the costs of the website. Mr Khalek said he thought it was unfortunate that TAG's offer had not been accepted by all in the spirit in which it had been made.
- 9.2 Mr Kirby asked whether the amount raised by the levy would be made public. Cllr Dibbs said that the Environment Fund had been started, with effect from 1 January 2003, with an initial contribution of £20k from TAG. From the same date, for each movement of an aircraft up to 50 tonnes, the levy was £2.00; over 50 tonnes, the levy was £5.00.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 10.1 Mr Marks asked whether the Chairman had attended the recent seminar for consultative committee chairmen in Bristol. Mr MacKay said he had not.
- 10.2 Mr Marks said there was to be a seminar on consultative committees in London on 8 December, under the auspices of the AEF. The agenda would include a presentation by Mr P Grindrod of the DfT. Admission would be £7.50 for AEF members, and £15.00 for non-AEF members. He invited any member who was interested in going to contact him for further details.
- 11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**
- 13.1 The committee confirmed that its next meeting would be held on Thursday 24 March 2005, at 2.00pm. It also agreed that the next following meeting would be held on Thursday 28 July 2005, also at 2.00pm.

G E T Green

Secretary, Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee

6 December 2004