



## FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**Draft Notes of the Meeting held at 2.00pm on Thursday 28 July 2005 in the BAe Systems Park Centre**

### **Present:**

#### *Chairman*

Mr R MacKay

#### *User Representatives:*

Mr M Khalek	GAMA Aviation
Mr L Rayment	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Sir Donald Spiers	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Miss K Wood	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd

#### *Local Authority Representatives:*

Cllr Mrs P M Devereux	Hampshire County Council
Cllr R L G Dibbs	Rushmoor Borough Council
Cllr M Drew	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Cllr Mrs M Hunt	Waverley Borough Council
Cllr N Lambert	Hart District Council
Cllr P Hutcheson	Hart District Council
Cllr J Starling	Rushmoor Borough Council

#### *Local Interest Representatives*

Cllr D Argent	Crandall Parish Council
Mrs D Knowles	Mytchett, Frimley Green and Deepcut Society
Mr G Marks	Farnborough Airport Residents' Association
Ms J Radley	Fleet and Crookham Civic Society

#### *Secretary:*

Mr G E T Green

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Mr R Brodhurst (Aravco), Mr W Epton (Farnborough Operators' and Residents' Committee), Mr R Kimble (Farnborough

College of Technology), Cllr V Scrivens (Farnham Town Council), Cllr D Attfield (Farnham Town Council Reserve), Cllr P Taylor (Rushmoor Borough Council), and Mr R Walker (TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd).

## **2. DRAFT NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 24 MARCH 2005**

### **2.1 Accuracy**

- 2.1.1 The draft notes of the meeting held on 24 March 2005 were approved as a true record. (But see paragraph 2.2.1 below, which records Mr Marks' query about the precise wording used by Cllr Dibbs at the last meeting.)

### **2.2 Matters Arising**

- 2.2.1 3.2.1 Without questioning the accuracy of the draft notes, Mr Marks queried the wording used by Cllr Dibbs in the penultimate sentence of this paragraph. He suggested, and Cllr Dibbs agreed, that the appropriate wording was "Risk and safety were not factors taken into account by Rushmoor Borough Council when the limit was established. It was established on the basis of noise alone." Referring to the last sentence of the paragraph, Mr Marks said he had hoped to discuss with the Council all the points raised in his response to the Chief Executive's letter, but this now looked unlikely. Having re-read the White Paper, Mr Marks had found no evidence to support the contention of the Chief Executive that the Council's approach to third party risk followed that taken by the government.

- 2.2.2 3.2.2 Referring to the last sentence of this paragraph, Mr Marks said that no attempt had been made at the time to explain in simple terms what the calculations indicated. He thought it would be helpful if the outcome of the TAG/AEAT "audit", which had no doubt been passed to Rushmoor Borough Council, were made available to the committee. Sir Donald Spiers said that information had been passed to the Council and, bearing in mind the need for commercial confidentiality, TAG would consider what details could properly be given to the committee.

#### **[ACTION: SIR DONALD SPIERS]**

- 2.2.3 7.8 Mr Marks pointed out that TAG and the operators should reasonably expect to receive the public's opinions, and expressions of concern about aircraft height or track, and that these would inevitably be subjective. Complaints were made when the height or track of an aircraft appeared to be different from what was expected. He said that responding to complaints provided TAG with an opportunity to explain procedures and regulations, and to show that breaches were not taken lightly. All this helped the process of educating the public.

- 2.2.4 9.1 Mr Marks said he understood that, the report having been submitted to Rushmoor Borough Council, the council had asked for it to be expanded. Was this available? Mr Rayment said he was unaware of the council's request but would enquire further.

**[ACTION: MR RAYMENT.]**

The Chairman proposed that agenda items 3 and 4 be transposed, the effect of which would be to facilitate questions about the TAG Information Report from members of the public. The committee agreed.

**3. TAG INFORMATION REPORT (INCLUDING THE HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS)**

- 3.1 Miss Wood referred to paragraph 2.1 of the report and said that it was proposed to move the portable monitor from Ewshot as it was not recording any noise.
- 3.2 It was noted with satisfaction that the approved number of week-end movements was not being exceeded. Ms Radley said she continued to hope that it would be possible to provide separate figures for take-offs and landings for each runway. Mr Rayment said that this data would be extremely difficult to provide, but in practice on any one day aircraft generally took off and landed in the same direction.
- 3.3 Mr Marks referred to the complaint dated 13 June (from 6 Church Road East, Farnborough). This was described as compliant by TAG, but this was not borne out by the information that TAG had sent to him. This appeared to him to be an example of failure to understand the rules. He circulated a paper about the complaint dated 5 April (from 132 Alexandra Road), which the list showed to be not compliant. Ms Wood said that the aircraft had been authorised by air traffic control to make a visual approach. Mr Marks referred to a letter written by the CAA's Legal Adviser. Mr Marks thought that the procedures that had been followed were not in line with that letter, and that Air Traffic Control were permitting themselves a greater degree of flexibility and discretion than was permitted under the rules. If this was happening, it should be made known. Mr Khalek said that there was some confusion. In one of the cases, the pilot was not complying with the correct procedures for a visual approach, but it did not follow that a visual approach was wrong in principle. Air Traffic Control were not allowing themselves an inappropriate level of discretion. Although he recognised that committee members would wish to discuss the contents of the report, he hoped that they would accept the report's intrinsic accuracy. If, however, there were doubts about this aspect, it might be better for them to be discussed outside the committee.
- 3.4 Cllr Hunt said that, despite the Chairman's concern that members of the public should be able to comment, the committee's discussion was going into too great a level of detail, the effect of which appeared to be to exclude the public.
- 3.5 Ms Radley said that there seemed to be a significant difficulty over what exactly "compliant" meant in the report. She was mystified how a flight by a large aircraft over Hartland Park on 7 July, about which she had telephoned TAG, could be regarded as "compliant". Mr Rayment said that the aircraft involved was a Navajo, which was not a large one. It had been chartered to take some business people to view a site. TAG had no control over what it was doing, but it was

operating entirely legally and within the rules. It was agreed that Miss Wood would let Ms Radley have such further details as she could.

**[ACTION: MISS WOOD.]**

- 3.6 Sir Donald Spiers drew members' attention to paragraph 6.2 of the report. He said that Flight Safety International's flight training facility was likely to bring large numbers of people into the area – up to some 200 per day – for periods of between two to five days. This should give a good boost to the local economy. Cllr Dibbs added that three new hotels were planned – one on the edge of the airfield, one elsewhere in Farnborough, and one in Aldershot. Two should proceed speedily, and all were provided for in the local plan.

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

- 4.1 A member of the public enquired about the phrase “authorised non-compliant letter” used in the report. Having explained the meaning briefly, Miss Wood said she would discuss this further with the questioner after the meeting. Mr Rayment said that future versions of the TAG Information report would include a clearer explanation of what was meant by “compliant” and more detail of the subjects of complaints.
- 4.2 Mr Bennison said that 1 Sandpit Cottages (see complaint dated 26 June) was in Tadpole Lane, not Sandy Lane. He said that this incident involved four aircraft, and it was difficult to accept that they were compliant. Miss Wood said she would check this.

**[ACTION: MISS WOOD.]**

- 4.3 Mr Bennison referred to the proposal to remove the mobile noise monitoring equipment from Ewshot and said he deplored this. He was surprised that it did not pick up the incident involving the four aircraft. If it was necessary to move the monitor from its present position, he would be happy to assist in finding another site for it in Ewshot. This was agreed.

**[ACTION: MS WOOD.]**

- 4.4 Mr Bennison referred to paragraph 7.2 of the draft notes of the 24 March 2005 meeting and said it was inaccurate to say that some ten years had elapsed since aircraft taking off from runway 24 had turned to port. Mr Rayment said it would probably have been more accurate to say that there had not been a published procedure for such a manoeuvre in that time. He would check this with Mr Walker on his return from holiday.

**[ACTION: MR RAYMENT/MR WALKER.]**

- 4.5 A member of the public said he accepted that, in general, take-offs and landings would be in the same direction, but there appeared to be a greater incidence recently of aircraft taking off to the east, despite the westerly prevailing wind. There was some discussion about this, during which it was observed that operators did not like to take off with a tail wind, even though a tail wind of up to

about 10 knots was tolerable. TAG invited members of the public to provide details of take-offs with a tail wind.

- 4.6 Mr Kirby made a number of points. He asked the committee to reconsider the idea of allowing members of the public to comment at the conclusion of each agenda item. If this was not accepted, the present arrangement should be extended beyond 15 minutes. He said that the committee did not appear to pursue effectively some of the points made during discussion. It was right that issues should be considered in some detail and that the committee was seen to scrutinise what went on at the airport. He wondered whether the press were invited to the meeting. He thought that the TAG Information report should contain much more detail than at present. He referred specifically to the complaint dated 13 June (from 6 Church Road East), and said he understood that some of the damage to the property was caused by a vortex. He understood that this risk had not been taken into account when planning permission was given for the airfield. He asked whether TAG paid for the damage. He referred to a planning officer's report on a house in Sycamore Road, which referred to the possibility of aircraft operating from the airfield being seen but was coy about the accompanying noise. On these last two points, Sir Donald Spiers said that TAG had paid for the damage caused to the house in Church Road East; and TAG had been a consultee on the planning issue in Sycamore Road, and their comments to the planning officer had been appropriate to this role. Cllr Dibbs said he could not recall whether or not the question of vortices arose during the process of considering planning approval.
- 4.7 Cllr Dibbs reminded the committee that it had considered at length in the past the question of how best the public might be involved in its proceedings. It had to be remembered that the meetings were "committee" meetings, and not "public" ones. He had suggested before that it might be helpful for TAG representatives to meet members of the public, perhaps immediately before each committee meeting.
- 4.8 A member of the public said that the public wished to have full details about operational matters at the airport. While many people had confidence in TAG, it was right that this should be tested through challenge, eg at meetings of this committee. He said there was a perception, perhaps an erroneous one, that, in light winds, runways were used in both directions. If figures were published which distinguished between take-offs and landings for each runway, the position would become clear. He thought that, as the aircraft flying over Hartland Park (see paragraph 3.5 above), was within the ATZ, TAG should have had some control over it. He asked whether aircraft could be held on the runway before rolling. On this point, Mr Rayment gave an assurance that this could (and in appropriate circumstances should) be done. It was noted that this issue was covered in a recent presentation to the committee. As regards the aircraft over Hartland Park, Mr Rayment said that it was under air traffic control, but not under TAG's control. Mr Khalek explained the inter-relationship between the ATZ, air traffic control's responsibilities, and the rules of the air. It was important to recognise that neither TAG nor air traffic control owned the airspace, although the latter had responsibility for regulating it.

## **5. COMMITTEE'S WEBSITE**

## **5.1 Update**

5.1.1 Cllr Lambert reported to the committee on the recent developments.

## **5.2 Conversion of working group to sub-committee**

5.2.1 Cllr Lambert referred to the paper which had been circulated with the agenda. He invited members' comments on the proposals. The committee agreed the proposed terms of reference and membership of the working party as set out in Cllr Lambert's report. It was agreed that the title of working party should be retained.

5.2.2 The Chairman thanked Cllr Lambert for his work on this.

## **6. MATTERS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ISSUES THAT ARE NOT ON THE AGENDA**

6.1 Ms Radley asked for further information about the environmental projects which would be supported by the fund which was accumulating from the fee paid by TAG for each take-off and landing. Cllr Dibbs said that Rushmoor Borough Council had invited Hart District Council to propose ideas but nothing had been heard. The fund stood at £89K, and it had been proposed to Rushmoor's cabinet that £45k should be allocated to the Fleet Pond Society and £40k to the Basingstoke Canal Management Committee. If the cabinet approved these proposals, the money would be released to the two bodies. This would leave £4k in the fund and, when it had built up again, Rushmoor proposed to invite the Local Strategic Partnership and this committee to make proposals for how it might be spent. Any proposals would have to be in line with the S106 agreement. Cllr Lambert said he was aware that Hart District Council had been approached and expressed his gratitude for the proposed donation to the Fleet Pond Society. Mr Marks welcomed the prospect of the committee being able to make its own proposals.

6.2 Ms Radley referred to the incident at Blackbushe Airport in April 2004, when a Raytheon 390 Premier crash landed there. She said that the notes of the committee's meeting in July 2004, at which she had raised this matter, recorded TAG as saying that the operator of the aircraft had never been to Farnborough. However, she understood from the report on the investigation into the incident that the aircraft had taken off from Farnborough immediately before it crash landed at Blackbushe. She asked for an explanation for this inconsistency and whether the aircraft could have suffered a similar fate at Farnborough. Mr Rayment said he did not know exactly what the notes said. But the position was that the aircraft was not a regular customer here. If the aircraft had crash landed at Farnborough, it would not have come off the runway (which was recognised in the report). Sir Donald Spiers added that the runway length at Farnborough was greater than at Blackbushe; and the friction coefficient at Farnborough was superior to that at Blackbushe – 0.86 and 0.51 respectively.

## **7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 7.1 Mr Marks said he had communicated with Ms Bartaby over a period of time about an approach monitoring aid. Sir Donald Spiers confirmed it was TAG's wish to have the best possible system. The one in use at Gatwick was not suitable for Farnborough. Work was continuing to identify the most suitable system, and TAG would report on this to the committee at the appropriate time.
- 7.2 Mr Marks asked whether TAG had been represented at a recent conference at Lasham to discuss the congested nature of the airspace in the local area. Mr Rayment said he was unsure, but Mr Walker had attended a CAA symposium a few weeks ago: this may have been the same meeting. Mr Rayment added that he would be surprised if TAG were not involved in the sort of discussion to which Mr Marks had referred.

## **8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

- 8.1 The committee agreed that its next meeting would be held on Thursday 10 November 2005, at 2.00pm, and that the following meeting would be on Thursday 23 March 2006.

G E T Green

Secretary, Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee

22 August 2005