



## FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**Draft Notes of the Meeting held at 2.00pm on Thursday 24 March 2005 in the BAe Systems Park Centre**

### **Present:**

#### *Chairman*

Mr R MacKay

#### *User Representatives:*

Mr J Batty	Business Users' Aircraft Association
Mr M Khalek	GAMA Aviation
Mr L Rayment	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Sir Donald Spiers	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr R Walker	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr C Way	Society of British Aerospace Companies

#### *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 Taylor	Rushmoor Borough Council

#### *Local Interest Representatives*

Cllr D Argent	Crandall Parish Council
Cllr D Attfield	Farnham Town 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

#### *In attendance*

Mr B Humphries	European Business Aviation Association
----------------	--

#### *Secretary:*

Mr G E T Green

## **1. MEMBERSHIP**

- 1.1 The Chairman expressed his gratitude to Ms A Bartaby, who had left TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd since the committee's last meeting. She had played a crucial part in setting up the committee in 2003, and had made a valuable contribution to its deliberations. He welcomed Sir Donald Spiers, who had joined the committee in Ms Bartaby's place.
- 1.2 The Chairman also welcomed to their first meeting Cllr D Argent of Crondall Parish Council, and Cllr D Attfield, of Farnham Town Council, who attended in the place of Cllr Scrivens.

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Mr R Brodhurst (Aravco), Mr R Kimble (Farnborough College of Technology), Cllr J Phillips (Surrey County Council), Cllr V Scrivens (Farnham Town Council), Cllr E Worrall (Ash Parish Council), and Cllr P Hutcheson (Hart District Council (HDC)).

## **3. DRAFT NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2004**

### **3.1 Accuracy**

- 3.1.1 The draft notes of the meeting held on 18 November 2004 were approved as a true record.

### **3.2 Matters Arising**

- 3.2.1 3.2.2 Cllr Dibbs referred to paragraph 10 of the amended letter dated 20 November 2004, a copy of which had been attached to the minutes of the 18 November meeting, and which Mr Marks had sent to Mr Lloyd, the Chief Executive of Rushmoor Borough Council (RBC). Cllr Dibbs said that this paragraph was misleading as the limit of 28,000 aircraft movements was unconnected with risk or safety; the figure referred rather to noise considerations. Mr Marks said he was sorry if he had misled, but pointed out that, in a submission to the Department of Transport, the RBC had referred to significant risk and safety constraints. Cllr Dibbs acknowledged this, but said that the limit on air movements was a separate matter, and risk and safety had no bearing on it. Mr Marks said he would have been pleased to have had the opportunity to discuss this with someone at RBC.
- 3.2.2 3.2.5 Mr Marks said that he had decided not to pursue the matter with RBC, given that the committee had said that this should be done in his capacity as a member of the public. Mr Marks acknowledged that the first sentence of paragraph 6 of his letter to Mr Lloyd was wrong in that he now knew that RBC councillors were aware of Mr Treadgold's calculations.

- 3.2.3 9.2 Ms Radley said that she had been approached by environmental groups in Hart District for further information about the Environment Fund. Cllr Dibbs said that the fund stood at £87k. Hart District Council had already been consulted (Cllr Lambert confirmed this), and all relevant parties would be consulted. He thought this would include Surrey Heath Borough Council. A number of organisations had proposed schemes. In answer to Ms Radley, he said that the Fleet Pond Society had registered their interest. Following the consultation process, proposals would be considered by RBC's Cabinet, which would make the final decisions; Cllr Dibbs was confident that a high degree of fairness would be achieved.

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

There were no questions from members of the public

#### **5. PROFESSIONAL FLIGHT DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS**

- 5.1 Mr Brian Humphries, of the European Business Aviation Association, gave a presentation about professional flight department operations. He defined the term "business aviation" (BA), and outlined the main characteristics of the BA sector. He also drew comparisons with other sectors of aviation, and other modes of transport, in terms of their impact on the environment, and referred to BA's effects on the profitability of companies involved in it and on the economy more widely. Answering the Chairman's invitation to talk about helicopters, Mr Humphries said that there had been significant advances in safety in recent years and, in the same period, Shell plc's experience of the use of helicopters was comparable, in safety terms, to that of the equivalent fixed-wing aircraft: in both cases the safety record was excellent. In the BA sector, helicopters were likely to develop, in the next few years, into a serious alternative to fixed-wing aircraft.
- 5.2 The following points were among those to emerge from the discussion after the presentation:
- i. a copy of the presentation would be placed on the committee's new website;
- [ACTION: MR RAYMENT/ CLLR. LAMBERT.]**
- ii. if aircraft were seen being flown in an unprofessional way, members of the public were encouraged to take their tail number and report incidents to the appropriate authority. It was recognised that other information such as the time of the sighting, the colour and type of aircraft, and flight direction would be helpful;
  - iii. the definition of BA used in the presentation had been approved by a sub-group of the ICAO and was formally recognised by the European Commission;
  - iv. the third runway at London Heathrow, which was now under consideration, was likely to have an effect on Northolt Aerodrome, which

was a military facility. Given its status as such, the aerodrome was unlikely to close, but the extent of BA there could be reduced;

- v. a high proportion of BA aircraft were equipped with the Enhanced Ground Proximity Warning System (EGPWS). Ordinary commercial aircraft were required by law to be fitted with EGPWS, but the BA sector had undertaken it voluntarily - and speedily;
- vi. the presentation had shown that businesses which had or used a BA capacity derived significant benefits. It could be said that the corresponding costs, including environmental ones, were being imposed on society generally. It was, however, necessary to recognise that the benefits of BA were not restricted solely to the companies that used it, in the sense that BA led to investment in local communities; and companies' increased profitability led to their paying more tax.

5.3 The Chairman thanked Mr Humphries for his interesting and informative presentation.

## **6. WEBSITE FOR THE COMMITTEE - UPDATE**

6.1 Cllr Lambert circulated copies of a report updating the committee on the website. He thanked the members of the working party - Mr Marks, Ms Moss (the Fleet and Crookham Civic Society's reserve representative on the committee), Mr Walker (TAG) and Ms Bartaby (TAG) - for their valuable work.

6.2.1 Cllr Lambert said that the website was now live but would be developed further. He outlined the scope of the material that was currently on it together with the areas which it was hoped to include in it soon. He asked that members who had not already done so to confirm their up to date e-mail addresses to him — [norman.lambert@hart.gov.uk](mailto:norman.lambert@hart.gov.uk) — as soon as possible, for inclusion on the website. As an alternative, committee members were invited to provide their telephone number.

**[ACTION: MEMBERS WHO HAVE NOT ALREADY CONFIRMED THEIR E-MAIL ADDRESS OR TELEPHONE NUMBER.]**

6.2.2 Cllr Dibbs congratulated the working group on its work, and suggested that users would find it helpful if there were more links on the home page to other parts of the site.

**[ACTION: WORKING GROUP TO CONSIDER.]**

6.2.3 Members considered the recommendations contained in Cllr Lambert's written report. It was recognised that, especially in view of the infrequency of the committee's meetings, the working group wanted authority to make changes to, and to develop, the website in a way which was acceptable to all members. After some discussion, it was agreed that:

- (a) Cllr Lambert would prepare a written report, for consideration by the committee at its next meeting, proposing the conversion of the working group to a sub-committee and draft terms of reference;

[ACTION: CLLR. LAMBERT.]

- (b) a press release should be issued about the website; and

[ACTION: CLLR LAMBERT]

- (c) links to other websites should be developed.

[ACTION: CLLR LAMBERT]

6.2.4 The Chairman thanked Cllr Lambert and all the members of the working party for their work on the website.

## **7. NOISE CONTOURS - UPDATE**

- 7.1 Mr Walker updated the committee and responded to the two-part question from the Fleet and Crookham Civic Society and their background note which was attached to the agenda as Paper A. He said that the perception that there was an increase in the number of incidents causing concern because of noise was unjustified. The volume of complaints was decreasing; and the number which related to incidents which proved to be non-compliant was very small.
- 7.2 Mr Walker said that the Noise Abatement Procedures were not a CAA document but had been agreed with RBC as part of the Section 106 Agreement; their primary purpose was environmental. The procedures did not currently permit turning right off runway 24 lower than 1800 feet or less than 2.5 miles. Aircraft taking off from runway 24 had not turned to port for some ten years. To do so, would put them over Ewshot and Farnham. A practical reason for turning to starboard, which would not have applied to military aircraft, was that aircraft could join the civil air traffic control network more directly than they would if turning to port.
- 7.3 Mr Walker observed that the FCCS's paper acknowledged that, nationally, incidents arising from full-power take-offs by aircraft wishing to attain a high rate of climb were extremely rare. Such take-offs occurred only rarely at Farnborough.
- 7.4 Ms Radley confirmed people's perception of the effect of noise. She said that there were green corridors in the Ewshot and Farnham areas, which should permit aircraft to turn to port without imperilling safety on the ground. She hoped that, in a spirit of good neighbourliness and to encourage good community relations, this would be considered. Mr Rayment pointed out that another reason why aircraft turned to starboard was to avoid air traffic into and out of RAF Odiham.
- 7.5 Ms Radley said that access to TAG's complaints line, particularly at week-ends and other out-of-office hours, could be difficult. Following criticisms which had

been made to her, she had rung the number recently, more than once, and had got a continuous ringing tone. Mr Rayment and Mr Walker regretted this, and told Ms Radley that, when such problems arose, she and any complainant should ring either the TAG switchboard or them direct. Mr Rayment pointed out that TAG's policy as regards maintenance of standards was not one of just reacting to complaints. He said that Ms Wood interrogated the data relating to tracks and flight paths pro-actively and regularly as a matter of course.

- 7.6 The Chairman observed that, following the air traffic control presentation at the last meeting, there seemed to be an imbalance between the number of comments made about alleged infringements and the small number of complaints that were found to relate to non-compliant operations.
- 7.7 Cllr Dibbs observed that there appeared to be a difference of mindset between residents either side of the aerodrome. Some residents on the east side were only a road's width away from the airport. Their impression was that some aircraft, when taking off to the east, turned to starboard at only about 500 feet: even so, this generated little comment. This contrasted with the position in Church Crookham where, even though aircraft were generally at about 2000 feet, there appeared to be a lot of concern. Mr Marks thought that a better description of residents to the east was that they were conditioned to the situation and were resigned to it. While the difficulty that a member of the public would have in estimating an aircraft's height was accepted, Mr Marks pointed out that TAG's systems could record this only to the nearest 100 feet, which raised the question of how TAG accurate was TAG's view of whether or not a flight was compliant.
- 7.8 Mr Batty said that he would refute any suggestion that the greatest care was not taken by pilots to exceed the minimum procedural requirements. Mr Khalek doubted that it was very productive to challenge TAG's data in the absence of clear evidence that it was defective. There was some debate about the basis on which matters such as this were discussed in committee. Some members pointed out that TAG had effective systems in place to record all relevant data (including that relating to environmental effects) about take-offs and landings, and all aerial activity within the controlled area. This data was made available to the committee. It was also noted that the number of complaints by members of the public was very small and reducing. Against this background they thought that challenges to the procedures that were followed needed to be well-grounded in fact, rather than rely on subjective opinions, especially given the obvious difficulty in estimating accurately from the ground the speed or altitude of an aircraft.
- 7.9 Mr Khalek agreed with the Chairman that aircraft could go beyond the 2.5 nautical mile point before turning. Ms Radley said she was sure that, if this were done more frequently, there would be a significant decrease in the volume of concern which was expressed.

## **8. TAG INFORMATION REPORT (including the handling of complaints)**

- 8.1 The Chairman informed members that paragraph 5.2 of the Information Report should refer to three, rather than four, non-compliant flights.

- 8.2 *Aircraft Movements.* In answer to Ms Radley, Mr Rayment said that applications for week-end flights would be rejected, if necessary, to ensure that the limit on such flights was not breached. Sir Donald Spiers said this would be done even though it might generate complaints from people who described themselves justifiably as good customers. A report which also showed details of MOD movements was submitted to RBC quarterly.
- 8.3 *Noise Monitoring.* Mr Rayment said that TAG were taking delivery of a high-standard replacement for the portable monitor which had failed; and they were also acquiring a back-up.
- 8.4 *Runway Use.* Ms Radley asked if the figures provided in the report for runway use could in future distinguish between take-offs and landings. Mr Walker said that this would be very difficult. He added that, generally, on any given day, both take-offs and landings would be from the same runway. Pressed by Ms Radley, Mr Walker said he would investigate whether the data could be provided. Mr Khalek wondered why this sort of detail was being asked for. Mr Marks said that take-offs were noisier; and, without the detail, it was difficult to see how risk contours could be calculated accurately. Mr Khalek said that, given what Mr Walker had said about runway use on any given day, a sufficiently accurate picture of take-offs and landings from and to each runway could be got by halving each figure shown in the table in the report.
- 8.5 *Complaints.* Members noted the complaints recorded in section 5 of the report.

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

- 9.1 In answer to Mr Marks, who asked when the report required under the Section 106 Agreement would be available, Mr Walker said it was being prepared now. The reason for the delay was that the Public Safety Zone was published in January 2004, and the 2004 report to RBC was therefore unable to take account of the first year of its operation. Mr Walker suggested that Mr Marks should discuss with him out of committee some other points which the latter wished to raise about the report, and Mr Marks agreed.

**[ACTION: MR WALKER AND MR MARKS.]**

**10. FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS FOR HANDLING MATTERS OR QUESTIONS WHICH COMMITTEE MEMBERS WISH TO RAISE AT MEETINGS**

- 10.1 The Chairman observed that the committee appeared to be evolving satisfactorily. Initially, there had been a large number of questions included on the agenda, meaning that the document had been a long one; but the number of questions had reduced over time. He thought this probably reflected members' recognition for the need for some balance.
- 10.2 In discussion, the following points emerged:
- (a) there remained concern about the length of the agenda when notice of a large number of questions was given;

- (b) some questions were long and tedious, and appeared to seek an excessive or unnecessary level of detail in the replies;
- (c) depending on the nature of a question, it might be possible to provide an answer at a meeting only if notice of it had been given;
- (d) some questions would be more appropriately asked and answered outside the committee;
- (e) it was noted that questions could appear on the agenda only with the approval of the Chairman, which meant that he could use his discretion in deciding whether or not a questions appeared.

10.3 Members noted the views that had been expressed. The general thrust was that a sensible balance should be observed so that, on the one hand, matters of importance to the committee could be explored, in an appropriate level of detail, by means of questions on the agenda while, on the other, questions on the agenda should not be too numerous and should avoid undue length and complexity; and in some cases questions should be asked of TAG directly outside the committee. Against this background, members agreed that the present arrangements for giving notice of questions should continue.

## **11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

11.1 Mr Marks referred to the seminar which he had mentioned at the last meeting and which he attended on 8 December 2004. He had taken the opportunity to say that the Farnborough committee ran very well, especially when compared with others known to him. Mr Marks expressed his thanks to Ms Bartaby for her work on the committee and wished to send her his best wishes for the future.

## **12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

12.1 The committee confirmed that its next meeting would be held on Thursday 28 July 2005, at 2.00pm.

G E T Green

Secretary, Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee

7 April 2005