

BIGGIN HILL AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of meeting held on Thursday, 29 April 2021 at 3pm. Due to the current Corona Virus (Covid-19) situation, it took place remotely by use of the Zoom on-line video conference facility.

Present:

Organisation:

Deputy Chairman (in the chair)
Secretary
Biggin Hill Airport Limited (BHAL)
Tandridge District Council
London Borough of Bromley (LBB)(Officer)
LBB
Flying Clubs and Schools
Private Owners
London Borough of Croydon
Biggin Hill Residents Association
LBB (Officer)
Bromley Residents Federation (BRF)
BRF/Leaves Green & Keston Vale Residents Association
Chairman of Noise & Safety Sub-Committee (ex-officio)
Tatsfield Parish Council
South London Business
Surrey County Council
London Borough of Bromley (LBB)
Private Owners

Representative:

Mr Nick Kemp
Mr George Crowe
Mr David Winstanley, Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
Councillor Martin Allen
Matthew Amer
Councillor Graham Arthur
Anoop Bamrah
Mr John High
Councillor Toni Letts
Mr Peter Martin
Mr Paul Mellor
Reverend John Musson
Mr Peter Osborne
Mr Richard Parry
Mr David Pinchin
Mr Deva Ponnosami
Councillor Becky Rush
Councillor Melanie Stevens
Mr John Willis

1. Welcome and Chairman's introductory remarks

- 1.01 Nick Kemp referred to the sad news of the recent death of John Bowden, the Chairman of the Committee. He referred to his brave fight against cancer and suggested and it was agreed that members should observe a minute silence to show respect for his memory and his family.
- 1.02 The Secretary advised that John's small family funeral service would be taking place on Wednesday, 5 May at Tunbridge Wells. The service would be streamed and the Secretary undertook to circulate details to members when received. John had asked that rather than flowers, donations be made to the Air Ambulance and the Hospice in the Weald. The family had added the Lymphoma Research Trust. David Winstanley advised that the Airport would be making donations to those charities and, subject to the agreement of the Committee, it would be happy for them also to be made on behalf of the Consultative Committee that he had served so long and in in such a sterling way (he had been its Chairman since April 2014 and its Deputy Chairman since July 2005). On behalf of the Committee the Chairman expressed the Committee's clear wish that it would like also to be associated with the donations.
- 1.03 The CEO added that he had only had the honour and privilege of knowing John for two years. He added that it was unusual for such a consummate Chairman to be so knowledgeable and informative as well as being independent. During the meeting several members added their condolences and made positive remarks about John and particularly about his chairmanship skills.
- 1.04 The Secretary asked that all members contribute to the on-line Book of Memorial for its former Chairman which ultimately would be forwarded to Patricia Bowden, John's widow.
- 1.05 At the end of the meeting, in answer to a question, the Secretary advised that the Constitution provided that the Chairman is appointed by the Airport, in consultation with the Committee. He anticipated that it would be dealt with at the Committee's next meeting.

2. Membership

- 2.01 The Committee noted that there had been no changes of membership notified to the Secretary since the last meeting.
- 2.02 During the meeting, Councillor Becky Rush asked whether it would be possible for a representative of Woldingham Parish Council to be added to the membership of the Consultative Committee. The Secretary advised that this would involve a change in the Constitution. Any proposal to change the Constitution must be submitted in writing to the Secretary at least thirty days before a scheduled meeting of the Committee is due and would need to be approved by the majority of the members present and voting at that meeting.

3. Apologies for absence

- 3.01 Apologies for absence were received from Mr Andrew Walters, Chairman of BHAL.
- 3.02 Apologies for late arrival were received from Anoop Bamrah, Reverend John Musson and Richard Parry.
- 3.03 Councillor Becky Rush apologised that she would have to leave the meeting early.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 28 January 2021

- 4.01 The minutes of the meeting had previously been provided to members in draft for suggested amendments and, subsequently, in their final form. As they had already been circulated and agreed by members, the Committee approved them as a correct record. It was agreed that the Chairman would sign them at the earliest opportunity.

5. Matters arising from the minutes

- 5.01 There were no matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting that would not be dealt with during the consideration of the agenda for this meeting.

6. Chief Executive Officer's report

- 6.01 David Winstanley presented his report which had recently been circulated. It provided information on the following issues that had arisen during the first quarter (January to March 2021). In presenting the report he advised that it was inevitably riddled with references to Covid-19 even though the Airport had fared better than many of its competitors during the pandemic for the reasons set out in paragraphs 6.10 - 6.14 below.
- 6.02 Market conditions across Europe - with the assistance of graphs and diagrams produced by WingX, the report updated the Committee on aviation activity in all countries in Europe. The CEO reminded the Committee that the period January to March 2020 was largely before the first Covid-19 lockdown was introduced. The different ways that individual countries had approached the crisis meant that the impact on air travel movements varied. The CEO illustrated this with examples from the graphs and, as examples he referred to Italy (11% up) and Russia (16% up) and conjectured that this was due to the different dates on which restrictions were introduced and the varying levels of their severity.
- 6.03 The second diagram showed that the effect on UK had been particularly bad and its movements had reduced by 36% year-on-year and 51% in the year to date. In the first national lockdown essential business travel was permitted whereas in the current third one, only travel that was essential and legal was allowed. Consequently, the impact on this quarter in 2021 had been far more severe.
- 6.04 Executive Summary – the Summary produced by WingX outlined changes, month-to-month, in global activity year-on-year, in the year to date and in the main regions. It showed that some

operators had been able to move their operations to countries where the restrictions had been less severe. He said that the Airport supported the Government’s current measures but that it was easier for him to say that than it would be for CEOs of other airports because Biggin Hill was not involved in the mass transportation business. The Committee’s attention was particularly drawn to the strength of the North American market, both internally and externally due to the aggressive stance being taken on vaccinations. He anticipated that this would mean that once this country’s restrictions were further lifted on 17 May, there would be a start to the resumption of longer reach global aircraft returning to Biggin Hill.

- 6.05 Biggin Hill movement summary - the report advised that the movements in the first quarter showed a significant reduction when compared to the same quarter of 2020 due to the third national lockdown and the fact that international travel was only permitted for legally approved reasons.
- 6.06 Whilst there had been a slight improvement in March, a more optimistic assessment for further recovery was tempered by uncertainty about the full extent of the recommendations from the Global Travel Task Force. Corporate travel continued to favour being by business aviation as opposed to scheduled services. The CEO added that the pandemic had made 2020 such an anomalous year that any statistical comparisons and future projections should be made using 2019 figures rather than last year’s. 2019 was a very busy year for Biggin Hill Airport and it should be assumed that statistics for 2020, particularly business movements, would have been similar to those for its preceding year if the pandemic had not occurred.
- 6.07 The CEO reminded the Committee that economic challenges remained and that the pressure on the aviation industry was immense. The statistics shown in the following paragraph showed that, apart from military, there were no areas of the Airport’s operations where there had been an increase in movements.
- 6.08 The following schedule that summarised the operational movements during the first quarter of 2021 was included in the report:

	Club Circuit	Club Other	Private Owner	Heritage	ATM Schld.	ATM Charter	Corp. Jet	Corp. Twin	Helis.	Military	Total
January	22	4	120	9	0	419	99	14	63	4	754
February	11	16	195	9	0	390	112	20	108	0	861
March	82	22	285	24	0	620	144	20	137	5	1,339
Total	115	42	600	42	0	1,429	355	54	308	9	2,954
Change	-128	-686	-736	-65	0	-1,004	-589	-7	-343	1	-3,557
Year to Date	115	42	600	42	0	1,429	355	54	308	9	2,954

6.09 During the same quarter of 2020 they had been:

	Club Circuit	Club Other	Private Owner	Heritage	ATM Schld	ATM Charter	Corp. Jet	Corp. Twin	Helis.	Military	Total
January	66	285	456	18	0	687	348	26	226	2	2,114
February	65	186	402	27	0	873	320	23	203	4	2,103
March	112	257	478	62	0	873	276	12	222	2	2,294
Total	243	728	1,336	107	0	2,433	944	61	651	8	6,511
Year to Date	243	728	1,336	107	0	2,433	944	61	651	8	6,511

- 6.10 Covid-19 - the report advised that the Airport’s strategy of prudent control of costs, marketing and clear internal and external communications, continued to be effective. It was vital that airports remain open to support the import and export of goods, medical equipment and supplies and the Airport had also operated a full range of business flights. It followed all quarantine restrictions regarding entry into the country.
- 6.11 In fact, the Airport continued to follow Government guidance and was amending its Covid-19 Health Action Plan in reaction to changing policies, procedures and practices. In February, it launched its own 4-step roadmap to the lifting of restrictions in line with the Government’s published programme. There was no expectation that there would be any special alleviations for business travel and no lobbying was taking place for exceptional treatment.

- 6.12 Since the Covid-19 outbreak in March 2020, there had been only 9 confirmed cases within the business all of which had been relatively minor and there had been no staff-to-staff transmission. Overall sickness and absence levels were remarkably low and over 31.2% of the staff (49 members) had received their first dose of a Covid-19 vaccine. No redundancies had been made and, in fact, recruitment was taking place. This situation was encouraging particularly as the average age of the senior members of staff was relatively high.
- 6.13 Most tenant companies had also fared reasonably well bearing in mind the circumstances.
- 6.14 The Airport continued to engage with the Department for Transport (DfT) via the Global Travel Task Force regarding recommendations covering the proposed traffic light system and associated testing policy for international travel. It had been hoped that the DfT would have addressed essential business travel or the impact on crews separately from holiday flights. However, early indications suggest that this level of differentiation had yet to be addressed. The Airport's priority continued to place people before profit and 'Protect the Business, Protect Jobs and Protect each other'. It was intended that this policy would continue beyond 21 June and some of the Health Action Plan measures may be retained indefinitely.
- 6.15 UK aviation policy and Biggin Hill Airport (LBHA)
London Airspace Modernisation Programme (LAMP) - the Committee was informed that the Airspace Change Organising Group (ACOG) had advised the Airport that the Government had agreed to provide financial support to remobilise the UK Airspace Change Programme. The funding would enable the 21 airports that form part of Future Airspace Strategy Implementation (FASI) South and North to complete the current phase of work, i.e., developing and assessing the options to upgrade the airspace structure and route network. This included Stages 1 and 2 of the regulatory process CAP1616, the outputs of which would be integrated into an overall Airspace Masterplan.
- 6.16 In answer to a question from Matthew Amer, the CEO advised that the Airport's positive relationship with Gatwick Airport should benefit residents in the vicinity of Biggin Hill environmentally. This is because that would allow larger aircraft operating from Gatwick or Heathrow to overfly this area.
- 6.17 It was noted that, through the assistance of the local Member of Parliament, Gareth Bacon, a telephone conversation had taken place with the Aviation Minister, Robert Courts. It had been an opportunity to emphasise the benefits of having a dedicated business aviation airport. He was asked to ensure that the Government would have early engagement with the business aviation industry on policy development to avoid mistakes being made by basing policy and funding solely or largely on the needs of the larger airports.
- 6.18 Deva Ponnoosami asked about Gatwick Airport being allowed to handle privately-owned aircraft. The CEO replied that he did not anticipate any impact on Biggin Hill because such aircraft would have to follow Gatwick's procedures whereas Biggin Hill offers a significant advantage in time-saving procedures. However, if it did impact on Biggin Hill then BHAL would look at an appropriate response. He added that BHAL was not interested in holiday flights because that would necessitate a huge expenditure to provide the required infrastructure.
- 6.19 *Aviation Strategy 2050 Green Paper* - it was noted that work continued to be in abeyance during the Covid-19 crisis.
- 6.20 RAF Northolt - it was confirmed that RAF Northolt had been de-notified from the UK Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP). The Airport continued to assess the impact on operators and the CEO advised that he would be reporting any further significant updates to the Committee. The Airport was continuing to liaise with operators to emphasise the dangers of using an airport with sub-standard safety standards.
- 6.21 Councillor Letts mentioned that she had previously written to the minister about the unfair competition who had responded that the issue would be considered. She asked whether the issue had been discussed with the Aviation Minister during the conversation referred to in paragraph 6.17

- above. The CEO replied that the discussions had been constructive and that Robert Courts had said that he would arrange for the Northolt issue to be further considered.
- 6.22 Airport facilities – the CEO prefaced this part of his presentation by informing the Committee that, despite the pandemic, BHAL was continuing to invest in the Airport at the present time.
- 6.23 *03 GPS approach* - it was noted that whilst the revised approach had entered its final stage of the approval process, progress was frustratingly slow. The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) was raising clarification requirements on technical elements of the design. The Airport had held a conference call with the CAA on 20 April about confirming the nominal track and applying some pressure to achieve a final approval of the airspace change proposal (ACP). The complexities involved in this final stage and the measures to be taken following approval and which would take 2 - 3 months to complete were outlined. It was noted that, nevertheless, it was still hoped that the approach could be in use from August 2021.
- 6.24 In answer to questions from Matthew Amer, the CEO thought that his expectation that the probability of a decision being reached by the CAA by the current deadline of 14 May was low. Each time a deadline was exceeded, the published deadline in the following month becomes the new target date. He added that from the date a decision is reached the introduction date would be approximately 2 - 3 months later.
- 6.25 *Runway/Taxiway works* – it was noted that final costings were being sourced for the resurfacing of taxiway Delta and Foxtrot and extending the apron outside hangar 446.
- 6.26 *Instrument Landing System (ILS), runway 21* - the CEO advised that the replacement ILS on runway 21 was completed at the end of March and the new system successfully passed its flight calibration and was now fully operational. It could be recalibrated to a slightly higher angle and that was also being considered in conjunction with the Overlay Airspace Change (see the following paragraph).
- 6.27 *21 RNAV Overlay Airspace Change* - the CEO reported that the Airport had now commenced Stage 2 of this ACP and had held its first Stakeholder focus group meeting. The intent was to replicate the existing approach and ensure the design would be safe and to minimise any environmental impact. The ACP was being designed to replicate what was the current situation when the Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Radio Range/Distance Measuring Equipment (VOR/DME) was removed by National Air Traffic Services. The CEO advised that responses had been received from residents to the north of the Airport asking for the new overlay to be at 3.5°. Runway 03 was already at 3.5°. This could mean that aircraft would be 60 – 80 feet higher than if it was at 3° over residential properties. The Airport would be supportive of this change for noise abatement reasons and would include it as an option in its submission to the CAA.
- 6.28 At the conclusion of the CEO's presentation of his report, Councillor Becky Rush asked whether the nominal track being finalised and to be sent to the CAA for approval was the one to the south of The Ridge. The CEO confirmed that it was. In answer to a follow-up question, the CEO advised that the earliest the change could be implemented was August and that depended on the Aeronautical Information Regulation and Control (AIRAC) being entered on 14 May. Further questions elicited the response that the post-implementation review (PIR) would start when the change was implemented. The procedure being followed including the PIR was fully described by the CEO with the ACP's criteria. During the PIR, it would be monitored by the Airport and the CAA and stakeholders including Woldingham Parish Council. Any comments on the operation of the track during the PIR period would be made to the Airport and the Airport would be obliged to report how these were responded to. After 6 months the report on the PIR would be made public. The CEO explained that Woldingham would be advised to study the operation of the 21 overlay although it might be thought that it would not be affected. This was because, although there were very few missed approaches, approximately 3-5 a year, any aircraft that do miss their approaches would need to loop around the village before making a new approach. The CEO agreed to check the actual number of missed approaches per year.
- Action: CEO**

- 6.29 Councillor Martin Allen advised that he had attended one of the Airspace Change focus meetings at which it was said that the number of missed approaches was twelve per annum. Councillor Allen said that, nevertheless, he had observed many more than twelve aircraft landing from the south. The CEO said that a distinction needed to be made between a missed approach and a visual circuiting approach from runway 21. He explained the difference and advised that ideally there would be an ILS on runway 03 which would obviate the practice for aircraft with ILSs to first approach using the ILS on runway 21 until the required visual references are obtained then circulate around Woldingham using a visual approach. A significant number of aircraft do that. There would be no increase or decrease in the number of aircraft using runway 03 arising from the overlay change and there would be no impact on Tatsfield. The CEO added that the Airport would have to consider a left turn due to a missed approach in its presentation to the CAA. This would not be ideal because the aircraft would be entering a busier airspace and it would contravene Government guidance in that it would create additional noise for the Tatsfield area.
- 6.30 *Additional Hangar Developments* - the Committee noted that the Airport continued to see a strong demand for additional hangars and was attempting to meet this demand through emerging contractual discussions. Such developments would go through the appropriate planning processes and, when appropriate, the Consultative Committee would be briefed on any specific proposals.
- 6.31 During the presentation of his report the CEO added that commercially confidential negotiations were taking place relating to a possible further hangar development of which the Committee would be provided with further information as soon as possible.
- 6.32 Tenants and businesses at Biggin Hill - members noted that the Airport continued to support key partners on the Airport. The return of light general aviation (GA) activity was to be welcomed and the Airport had chosen to freeze some charges and offer additional discounts for light GA to encourage its return. Key tenants and partners were being supported with a range of initiatives to help the Airport's community tackle the challenges presented by Covid-19. Although not yet approved by the BHAL Board, investigations were being carried out to see how the Airport might manage Airport charges during the next financial year.
- 6.33 Economic Development/LoCATE@BigginHill
Bombardier Hangar development - the hangar development was ahead of programme and formal discussions were taking place with the funder and Bombardier regarding potential early completion, hopefully in December as opposed to the scheduled completion in March 2022. The CEO remarked that this was a remarkable performance given the extent of the development and the additional restrictions imposed arising from the pandemic. He added that this development was hugely important for the future of the Airport, it being the company's future European base.
- 6.34 *College Update* - the Committee heard that Covid-19 had affected the ability of the college to be developed as planned and, working with LBB, an alternative site for the aerospace and green technology college was now being sought. Although BHAL would have preferred it to be on the Airport, it accepted the realities and supported this new approach. In answer to a question from Councillor Toni Letts, the CEO said that he thought that a site would be sought as close as possible to existing facilities and that it could be relocated to the Bromley campus, only a few miles from the Airport. The Airport and its resident businesses would be continuing to work in partnership with LSEC to provide aircraft and facilities to students on its aerospace and technology courses. LSEC had approached the GLA to continue funding of the project.
- 6.35 *Airport Hotel* - the CEO was pleased to inform the Committee that, in partnership with LBB, all planning conditions had been actioned and work had commenced on site in early March. The selection of a preferred contractor was being progressed. In parallel with this activity, the Airport had submitted a minor material amendment application. The CEO advised that the target completion date was November 2022 although this could, hopefully, be brought forward. He reminded the Committee that the Hotel would be owned and operated by BHAL and advised that a General Manager to run the hotel was currently being recruited.

- 6.36 Deva Ponnoosami in a question/comment said that dealing with minor amendments can take a considerable amount of time. The CEO replied that he was confident that LBB was being as positive and constructive in dealing with the application as possible bearing in mind the current pandemic restraints.
- 6.37 *West Camp Development* - it was noted that the Airport continued to engage with Pentridge Estates, English Heritage and LBB regarding the potential redevelopment of elements of West Camp. In the meeting the CEO advised that Andrew Walters had not been able to attend the Consultative Committee meeting because he was at a meeting on site. He added that the Airport was anxious to avoid a piecemeal redevelopment of the site. It was generally agreed that a masterplan for the development of the site was required.
- 6.38 Health & Safety/security - the report advised that there had been no significant security breaches or occurrences since the last report. Health and Safety activity had focused on the protection of staff against the risks of Covid-19.
- 6.39 In the meeting the CEO reported that there were two safety issues which were being addressed. There had been a spike in incidents of lasers being directed at aircraft using the runway 21 approach. The Airport was working with the Metropolitan Police on managing the problem. He added that the green spectrum light was particularly dangerous at night. The second issue was drones. Whilst there had been no increase in encroachments recently, an initiative to educate people into understanding that drones cannot be flown in the vicinity of an airport.
- 6.40 Environment
- Noise contours* - the CEO's report referred to the quarterly report produced by Bickerdike Allen Partners LLP (BAP) about the noise contour maps (see minute 7 below).
- 6.41 *Airports Council International (ACI) Airport Carbon Accreditation Scheme* - the Airport had formally signed up to the ACI Airport Carbon Accreditation Scheme and the Airport's Sustainability Statement outlining its commitment to support LBB's intention to become carbon neutral by 2029 had been launched. The scope of the extensive mapping exercise of the Airport's emissions that was required to be carried out in the first year was outlined. In this respect, it was noted that the Airport was working with companies that were working on innovations for electrification of aircraft engines. One example was a company called Volocopter that had a concept of a 100% electric-powered airborne vehicle. The CEO also outlined the work to be carried out in subsequent years to achieve the 5 stages for achieving the accreditation.
- 6.42 The Committee noted that the Airport was also embarking on a series of other environmental measures and, for instance, had just procured two fully electric vehicles for its passenger handling services.
- 6.43 It was also noted that from 1 April, the Airport had been selling sustainable aircraft fuel (SAF). At present the fuel contains only 30% SAF because aircraft engines cannot run on pure SAF. However, Boeing was currently working on an engine that would be able to do so. At the conclusion of the CEO's presentation of his report, Councillor Stevens asked whether the SAF would reduce the smell from engines and whether it would be better for the environment. The CEO answered by saying that it would be slightly better so far as the smell was concerned. However, SAF fuel was greener in that it was designed to reduce the amount of CO₂ produced during its production rather than in its use. Councillor Martin Allen also asked for more information about SAF and the CEO clarified that the emissions from SAF would have similar CO₂ emissions to normal aircraft fuel. To date, it had not been possible to produce an aircraft engine that would run on biofuel and meet the strict requirements on aircraft performance. The CEO added that SAF costs twice as much to produce as Jet A1 fuel. The Airport would be selling it at cost price and expecting aircraft operators to use it as their contribution to the improvement of the environment.
- 6.44 *Review of the Noise Action Plan (NAP)* - as part of the Deed of Variation to vary the Airport's operating hours in 2017, the Airport agreed to undertake a review of the NAP every 5 years. A start had been made on the review and the aim was to submit the revised NAP to LBB by July. The topics

to be covered were set out in the CEO's report and enlarged upon in the meeting. It was the intention that the draft would be shared with the Committee prior to it being forwarded to LBB and the CEO said that he would be keen to receive members' comments on it.

- 6.45 Councillor Arthur commented that the topics to be covered in the NAP which were set out in the report were appropriate and that it was good that this Committee would have the opportunity to comment on it before it goes to LBB because it had a good understanding of the subject and can look at it dispassionately.
- 6.46 Referring to paragraph 5.02 of the minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2021, The CEO mentioned that the accuracy of Webtrak would be mentioned in the NAP and that complicated algorithms on radar data had been received from that company which were being studied.
- 6.47 Later in the meeting, David Pinchin asked whether there had been any resolution of the issues with Webtrak. The CEO responded with a full and technical description of the way that the discussions were taking place with Webtrak and advised that he believed that the system was as accurate as it could be based on deficiencies of radar and the data due to the distance, approximately 19 – 20 miles, of the radar apparatus from Biggin Hill, suppressed codes and other factors. For the NAP, this needed to be proved and work was continuing to ascertain that this was the case. If it was proved not to be able to do that a decision would have to be made about whether Webtrak was the best available tool. It had enabled the Airport to significantly reduce blatant penetrations into noise sensitive areas (NSAs).
- 6.48 The CEO also mentioned that he had apologised to Councillor Allen for answering a comment of his saying that an intrusion had not occurred when it had. He was now looking at finalising the southern boundary of the Tatsfield NSA.
- 6.49 At the conclusion of the presentation of the CEO's report the Chairman thanked him for it and commented that it showed that there was still a lot of positivity despite the difficult times. This was echoed by other members during their contributions to the meeting.

7. Noise contours

- 7.01 The CEO reported on the quarterly report produced by Bickerdike Allen Partners LLP (BAP) about the noise contour maps that were attached to the CEO's report and had been previously circulated.
- 7.02 The CEO summarised the BAP report by saying that, as usual, all noise levels remained well within the agreed limits set out in the Airport's Noise Action Plan.
- 7.03 It was noted that, for the daytime and early morning periods both contour areas were well within the areas prescribed. There had been 17 movements during the late evening period (10 - 11pm), with a maximum of 5 movements in a single late evening period which occurred on one day. There had been 15 movements during the early morning period (6.30 - 7pm), with a maximum of 2 movements on one day. For both periods this was fewer than the limit of 8 movements in a single late evening or early morning period, excluding military movements.
- 7.04 The noise contour maps were based on the average daily movements in the period and showed that for the daytime period the contour area limit was 4.3 km² and reasonable endeavours were to be used to keep it no more than 2.9 km². The area for the quarter's contour was less at 0.8 km².
- 7.05 For the late evening period reasonable endeavours were to be used to keep the contour area no more than 1.3 km². The area for this contour was less at 0.1 km². For the early morning period reasonable endeavours were to be used to keep the area no more than 2.2 km². The area for the contour was lower at 0.4 km². The CEO added in his presentation of the report that it would be disingenuous for him to claim credit for keeping within these noise contours when there had been so many fewer flights.
- 7.06 Councillor Stevens referred to complaints from residents in the Jail Lane area regarding noise from extended periods of static running of aircraft engines and asked whether this practice could be restricted. She referred to an agreement made with the former Airport Director, Jenny Munro, which

she understood stipulated that the practice could only take place for a maximum of 20 minutes. The CEO replied that this issue had been raised at the meeting of the Sub-Committee and said that there were extensive restrictions and the only place where ground running of engines could occur was on Taxiway Charlie and only in idle mode. The taxiway was about the only place which was in the centre of the Airport with a sufficient hard standing. There was also a requirement that it could only happen with the approval of the CEO or Senior Air Traffic Controller and for 15 minutes only. In certain weather conditions the noise would be heard by residents. He concluded by saying that the restrictions were to be included in the revised version of the NAP (paragraph 6.44 - 6.46 above).

7.07 Richard Parry in his presentation of his report on the latest meeting of the Noise and Safety Sub-Committee (minute 8 below) mentioned that it had discussed that issue and had suggested that Sunday lunchtime and immediately afterwards was perhaps not the best time to allow the running of aircraft engines. John High suggested that the running of jets' auxiliary power units which goes on for longer than engine ground-running may cause more of a nuisance. Richard Parry replied that there had only been two incidents about which there were complaints and they were both about aircraft engines. The CEO commented that the Aerodrome Manual Supplementary Instruction restricts the use of both aircraft engines and APUs and he read out some of the examples. He added that these restrictions were over and above what were included in the Airport lease.

8. Report by the Chairman of the Noise and Safety Sub-Committee

8.01 Complaints and comments - the report of the Flight Evaluation Unit for the first quarter of 2021 had been emailed to members shortly before the meeting. It showed that during the three months there had been 2,954 movements at the Airport compared with 6,556 in the same quarter of 2020.

8.02 In addition to the report referred to in the preceding paragraph the following had also been emailed to members on the day of the meeting:

- the report of Richard Parry, the Chairman of the Sub-Committee;
- a paper providing outline information about the complaints/infringements and, where they had been also referred to the Airport's Safety and Noise Abatement Review Board (SANARB), a summary of the Board's findings and its decisions;
- a map that plotted the areas from which the complaints/comments had emanated.

8.03 Richard Parry's report advised that, including four automatically identified track deviations, there had been a total of 35 incidents/complaints.

8.04 The Consultative Committee noted that thirteen of the complaints emanated from Farnborough. Eight were from Tatsfield (including the four that were generated automatically), four came from Orpington and three originated from Biggin Hill. The remainder were from New Addington, Keston, Down, Leaves Green and Petts Wood. As usual, all complaints had been processed expeditiously by the Airport's staff using the regularly reviewed, comprehensive, established and continually evolving procedures.

8.05 Richard Parry, in his presentation of his report, commented that the small number of noise or tracking violation complaints or comments and Noise Monitoring and Tracking System (NMTK)-generated incidents was because that there had been so few flights in the quarter. He referred to problems from helicopter movements and mentioned that the most significant noise had been from an emergency helicopter movement.

8.06 Richard Parry pointed out that all complaints, etc., had been dealt with in a business-like manner but he referred to one reply to a person who regularly communicates with the Airport that could have been handled differently.

8.07 He also referred to the airport safety section of his report and particularly to the dangerous use of lasers which had been discussed by the Sub-Committee (see also paragraph 6.39 above). A number of foreign objects had been found on the Airport and that bins had been installed and instructions issued to prevent such objects finding their way onto the runway.

8.10 Councillor Martin Allen commented that he did not think that the maps issued with responses to complainants were helpful as it was difficult for them to see where the track was in relation to the white dot which showed where the complainant lived. He also said that some of the figures in the report appeared to be incorrect. In response Richard Parry apologised for the incorrect figures and explained that he had not had access to the internet and had not, therefore, been able to check the draft report. He undertook to check the report and to reissue it with corrected figures.

Action: Richard Parry

8.11 Councillor Allen thanked the CEO for including in the complaints report where minor infringement reports had been issued. He apologised to him and said that he had not intended to suggest that the Airport was hiding something or to cause offence by doing so. He said that the complaints report showed that the intrusion referred to in paragraph 6.46 above was compliant. The CEO apologised and said that it was accepted that the intrusion had occurred and that the matter was to be taken up with the pilot concerned and a minor infringement warning issued.

8.12 It was noted that Councillors Martin Allen and David Pinchin were awaiting details of the arrangements to enable them to track a flightpath of a spitfire by a visual check on the ground and a flight check in the air against Webtrak.

9. Planning issues

9.01 London Plan - Paul Mellor reported that the new London Plan had been published on 2 March 2021. It now formed part of the planning documents for LBB alongside the Local Plan which was now required to be reviewed, a process that would be starting later this year. This would include a 'Call for Sites' (an opportunity for individuals, landowners and developers to suggest sites for development) and an Economic Land Assessment. A local plan review tends to be a 2-3-year process.

9.02 Permitted Development Rights (PDR) - referring to the information mentioned in the minutes of the 16 July 2020 meeting (paragraph 9.01) and the last meeting (paragraph 9.03), Paul Mellor advised that there had been further consultation on PDRs for change from commercial and the new Class E (retail, restaurants, offices, etc) use to residential. It was likely that this would have an economic effect, particularly on the town centre. However, it was not possible to assess this at present. LBB was currently preparing Article 4 Directions to protect office and industrial space. It was likely that the Council be looking at the possibility of producing more such Directions to protect further important economic uses.

9.05 Planning reform - there was no further information on the Government's proposed broader planning system changes. In the meantime, the Government was trialling minor areas for reform including digitisation of the planning system.

9.05 Congestion charge extension - referring to paragraph 9.05 of the minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2021, the Committee was informed by Paul Mellor that the proposed extension of the congestion charge zone had been rejected by the Mayor of London.

9.05 Airport Hotel - the Committee was informed that the application for minor amendments would be determined around 22 June 2021.

9.06 College – referring to paragraph 6.34 above, Paul Mellor undertook to inform the Committee if he had any updates on the planning application for the College development.

10. Community Relations

10.01 Press cuttings - the press cuttings for the last quarter had been circulated with the agenda for the meeting.

10.02 There were no comments on the press items.

11. Any other business

- 11.01 Sky Dive - Councillor Melanie Stevens reported that she would be doing a sky dive to raise money for The Chartwell Cancer Trust and that any member who wished to sponsor her could do so through Virgin Money Giving.

12. Dates of next meetings

- 12.01 The Committee was reminded that it had been agreed that the next meetings would be held at 3pm on the following dates:
- Thursday, 29 July 2021;
 - Thursday, 28 October 2021;
 - Thursday, 27 January 2022.
- 12.02 Peter Martin asked whether it would be possible that the next meeting would be held at the Airport. The CEO replied that it would be held at the Airport if that would be at all possible.

The meeting closed at 4.50pm.