

**BIGGIN HILL AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of meeting held on Thursday, 28 October 2021 at 3pm at Biggin Hill Airport.**

---

**Present:**

**Organisation:**

Chairman  
Deputy Chairman  
Secretary  
Biggin Hill Airport Limited (BHAL)

Tandridge District Council  
London Borough of Bromley (LBB)(Officer)  
Private Owners  
Biggin Hill Residents Association  
LBB (Officer)  
London Borough of Bromley Residents Federation (BRF) &  
Leaves Green & Keston Vale Residents Association  
Chairman of Noise & Safety Sub-Committee (ex-officio)  
Tatsfield Parish Council  
South London Business  
LBB  
Private Owners

**Representative:**

Mr Peter Greenyer  
Mr Nick Kemp  
Mr George Crowe  
Mr Andrew Walters, Chairman of BHAL (remotely by Zoom)  
Mr David Winstanley, Chief Executive Officer (CEO)  
Councillor Martin Allen  
Matthew Amer  
Mr John High  
Mr Peter Martin  
Mr Paul Mellor  
Mr Peter Osborne  
Mr Richard Parry  
Mr David Pinchin  
Mr Deva Pannoosami  
Councillor Melanie Stevens  
Mr John Willis

**1. Welcome and Chairman's introductory remarks**

- 1.01 The Deputy Chairman, Nick Kemp, on behalf of the Committee welcomed the new Chairman, Peter Greenyer, to his first meeting.
- 1.02 The Chairman, in his introduction of himself, advised that he was honoured and pleased to be its chairman. The former Chairman, John Bowden had been a great friend and he hoped to measure up to his excellent example. He was looking forward to undertaking the role and he added that, whilst he was very positive about the Airport, would be an impartial Chairman.
- 1.03 Peter Greenyer continued by outlining to members his business background and said that he was an accountant who had until recently been the managing director of a truck dealership. He was a tenant of the Airport as the owner of Shipping & Airlines and was also a private aircraft owner based at the Airport.

**2. Membership**

- 2.01 The Committee noted that that Councillor Michael Rutherford, as Bromley Council's portfolio holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management had replaced Councillor Graham Arthur as one of its representatives.
- 2.02 Richard Parry reported that he would approach the relevant new portfolio holder at Kent County Council about the possibility of filling the vacancy for a representative of that authority on the Committee.

**3. Apologies for absence**

- 3.01 Apologies for absence were received from Anoop Bamrah (Flying Clubs and Schools), Councillor Roddy Hogarth (Sevenoaks District Council), Councillor Toni Letts (London Borough of Croydon), Reverend John Musson (Biggin Hill Residents Association) and Councillor Becky Rush (Surrey County Council).

- 3.02 Apologies for late arrival were received from Peter Osborne.
- 3.03 Councillor Martin Allen, Deva Ponnosami apologised when they had to leave the meeting before its conclusion (see paragraph 11.09 below).

#### **4. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 July 2021**

- 5.01 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 to members and published, the Committee approved them as a correct record and they were signed by the Chairman.

#### **5. Matters arising from the minutes**

- 6.01 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.

#### **7. Chief Executive Officer's report**

- 7.01 The CEO, David Winstanley, presented his report which had recently been circulated. It provided information on the following issues that had arisen during the second quarter (July to September 2021). He advised that, due to the substantial items on the agenda for the meeting, he would present it more briefly than was usual.

- 7.02 Market conditions across Europe  
With the assistance of graphs and diagrams produced by WingX, the report updated the Committee on aviation activity in Europe and world-wide. He reminded members that, due to the effect of the Covid-19 epidemic on activity last year, 2021's year-on-year comparisons were being made with 2019 not 2020. He pointed out that the second graph showed that most European countries had experienced increases in movements in September compared with the same month of 2019.

- 7.04 WingX report - Executive Summary  
The CEO referred to the summary produced by WingX which outlined changes, month-to-month, in global activity year-on-year, in the year to date and in the main regions and, the year-to-date situation. This particularly mentioned that there had been a summer rebound that had produced a 0.2% increase in activity globally.

- 7.05 In response to a question from Councillor Martin Allen the CEO said that he did not expect scheduled airports such as Heathrow and Gatwick to fully recover for various reasons until 2022/23 and domestic air passenger duty increases would not help either. He added that what was not clear was whether the bounce back was due to latent demand arising from the epidemic and whether activity would fall back again.

- 7.06 Biggin Hill movement summary  
The CEO's report advised that the movements trend in the third quarter of the year showed that they had improved when compared to the same quarter in 2020 and the previous quarters so far this year. This reflected a promising bounce back for the aviation industry and, more specifically, business aviation. The relaxation of travel restrictions, latent demand in the market and a shift in travel behaviours had all contributed to this increase. Notwithstanding this improvement, the Airport needed to be cautiously optimistic about the long-term recovery and remained alert to any resurgence of Covid-19 and any fragility in the economy.

- 7.07 August and September were noticeably busier than preceding months and the early signs were that October would be another record month. The lifting of US restrictions would undoubtedly provide an additional boost in November and the Airport was well placed to take advantage of this. The

Airport’s impressive performance throughout the pandemic had created confidence in the market and showed that this recovery was well deserved.

7.08 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
July	73	546	609	1,026	0	1,429	362	33	426	8	4,512
August	60	564	568	1,170	0	1,573	388	44	270	29	4,666
September	31	486	691	1,011	0	1,697	574	55	428	12	4,985
Total	164	1,596	1,868	3,207	0	4,699	1,324	132	1,124	49	14,163
Change	-114	216	-536	1,405	0	854	408	40	257	34	2,564
Year to Date	585	3,167	4,159	4,732	0	8,941	2,544	295	2,194	74	26,691

7.09 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
July	152	394	990	422	0	1,303	291	9	303	15	3,879
August	45	459	680	633	0	271	43	263	0	0	3,885
September	81	527	734	747	0	1,051	354	40	301	0	3,835
Total	278	1,380	2,404	1,802	0	3,845	916	92	867	15	11,599
Year to Date	815	2,116	5,010	1,902	0	7,751	2,381	244	1,909	48	22,176

7.10 Covid-19

The report advised that whilst the Airport was still adapting its response to the current crisis, the strategy of combining prudent control of costs with active marketing and clear, unambiguous internal and external communications continued to be effective. Concerns remained regarding the long-term impacts of Covid-19 and some restrictions were still in place.

7.11 The numbers of staff who had contracted the virus and the percentages of them who had been vaccinated were listed and it was noted that, as traffic levels had recovered, the Airport’s staffing focus had turned to promoting aspects of well-being and stress awareness. BHAL was committed to protecting the health, safety and welfare of all colleagues and was utilising an Employee Assistance Programme as a service for everyone. It enables Airport colleagues to access professional expertise, depending on the nature of concern. The priority to place people before profit and *Protect the Business, Protect Jobs and Protect each other* was being maintained.

7.12 The Airport’s Covid testing facility had been extremely active; supporting crews, members of staff and residents to take tests to meet travel restrictions. The Mansi Suite had provided tests for over 6,000 people since it opened last year. However, it was planned to reopen the Lookout café towards the end of December and relocate the Mansi Suite.

7.13 UK aviation policy and Biggin Hill Airport

*London Airspace Modernisation Programme (LAMP)* - the report reminded members that LAMP was a critical programme to ensure that airports can develop modern routes that would be both safe and reduce noise impact on residents. Now that Government funding was in place the Airspace Change Organising Group (ACOG) was now pressing ahead to ensure that LAMP progresses towards completion of Stage 2 of the airspace change proposal (ACP).

7.14 There were still concerns regarding the number of individual sponsors driving through what is a national infrastructure project. The Airport had voiced its concerns regarding the potential confusion for many residents who could be likely to receive multiple consultations about the same issues. The CEO answered Councillor Martin Allen’s request for a clarification of this point by explaining that without only one sponsor such as ACOG, residents could receive many consultation letters if similar representations were made by more than one person/organisation.

7.15 *Aviation Strategy 2050 Green Paper* - it was noted that, understandably, work continued to be in abeyance during the Covid-19 crisis.

7.16 RAF Northolt

The Committee was informed that the Airport's engagement regarding its concerns about safety and unfair competition with the increasing civilisation of RAF Northolt had picked up pace over the last quarter. Direct engagement with the Department for Transport (DfT) continued regarding the use of taxpayer's money to underwrite the use of a Ministry of Defence (MoD) asset as a commercial enterprise. The safety concerns about the limited publication of all approach obstacles were particularly being highlighted. The Airport was only asking for there to be equality of conditions for all business airport and BHAL was seeking to:

- obtain the outcome of a DfT/MoD meeting held in October which discussed the Northolt operation.
- arrange a face-to-face meeting with the DfT, MOD and the three Business Aviation Airports.
- potentially commission a report on the safety implications of the failure of the MoD to publish obstacle data.
- investigate legal options regarding unfair competition.

7.17 Airport facilities

*03 GPS approach* - members of the Committee were advised that the Airport remained at Stage 5 of the procedure and all elements of the Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) design approval process had been submitted. Once approved, the Airport would be able to undertake the validation process, the plan for which consisted of two separate elements of simulation, a real-time flight and simulation under various weather conditions. These activities must be undertaken by using approved coded data to ensure the procedure would be safe and flyable. The Airport awaited formal feedback from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) prior to moving towards simulation and validation.

7.18 The CEO was asked if there was any update available and he reported that the CAA had been asked if it could provide a deadline for when the feedback would be provided. In response to a question from the Chairman the CEO said that Andrew Walters was frequently asking the CAA for updates on any progress. The CEO added that the Airport was losing business to Farnborough Airport due to the delays in implementing the new approach.

7.19 *Runway/Taxiway works* - it was noted that the resurfacing works on Taxiway Echo had been completed following the similar works undertaken on Delta and Foxtrot. The planning for additional apron space in front of hangar 446 was also completed and the Airport was now phasing this work with other development priorities.

7.20 *Fuel Farm development* - the Airport had now ordered the additional new tank and module delivery system to start the modernisation programme to upgrade the existing fuel farm. The works would be completed in time to meet Government regulations coming into force in 2023. The Airport continued to supply Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF) in accordance with its Sustainability Statement and its strategy to reduce CO2 emissions.

7.21 During the presentation of the report the CEO said that the sales of SAF had been very low due to its high cost at present. He mentioned that the provision of hydrogen fuel was being investigated and, in answer to comments there was a short discussion about the availability of various aviation fuels. In response to a question from the Chairman he said that Avgas 100LL would be retained. It was noted that leaded fuel was now being phased out generally and Boeing had made an aircraft that runs on 100% SAF but that it had not yet been brought into production.

7.22 *21 RNAV Overlay Airspace Change* - the CEO's report also told members that the Airport had completed Stage 2 of this procedure and was now responding to the initial feedback received from the CAA. The Airport was not able to proceed to Stage 3 until it had addressed all CAA observations and had received formal approval from the CAA to progress.

7.23 *Enhancements to Churchill Way* - the Committee was notified that the Airport was now ready to procure a phased scope of works to enhance Churchill Way and that these would include surface

repairs, security, lighting and fencing. The target commencement date was February 2022, with the surfacing continuing post the completion of the proposed hotel and Bombardier hangar.

- 7.24 *Additional Hangar Developments* - the strong demand for additional hangars persisted and the Airport was addressing this demand through contractual discussions. Such developments would go through the appropriate planning processes and it was noted that, when appropriate, the Airport Consultative Committee would be briefed on any specific proposals.
- 7.22 *Site-wide utilities* - the Committee heard that an Asset Register and Asset Management Framework was being created and would include identifying the Airport's critical assets and utilities and a roadmap to achieve the right service, resilience and capacity.
- 7.23 Tenants and businesses at Biggin Hill  
Members noted that the Airport continued to support the Airport's key tenants and partners with a range of initiatives to help the Airport community to tackle the economic challenges arising from the restrictions placed on aviation throughout the Covid pandemic. The CEO commented that it was pleasing to note the community's recovery which was critical for the local economy.
- 7.24 Economic Development/LoCATE@BigginHill  
*Bombardier Hangar development* - despite the impact of Brexit on the supply chain continuing to be challenging, the development was still progressing on time and on budget and work towards achieving practical completion was continuing.
- 7.25 *Hotel Update* - planning approval for a minor material amendment had been obtained and construction on the hotel was progressing well. The principal contractor was currently completing work on the foundations and it was hoped that the steel construction would be starting in late November/early December. The target completion date was November 2022.
- 7.26 During the presentation of the report the CEO mentioned that it was the intention that the Hotel would be called 'The Landing'.
- 7.27 *West Camp Development* - it was noted that the Airport continued to engage with Pentridge, English Heritage and LBB regarding the potential redevelopment of elements of West Camp. The CEO, responding to a question from Councillor Melanie Stevens, said that the discussions were progressing well despite the difficulties arising from many of the structures being on the list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. There were currently no definite proposals, but it was hoped that a draft plan could be available early in 2022.
- 7.28 Health & Safety/security  
The report advised that there had been no significant security breaches or occurrences since the last report and that activity had focused on the protection of staff against the risks of Covid-19. The CEO added that plans had been reviewed to take account of the possibility of attempted disruption by environmental pressure groups.
- 7.29 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 10 below).
- 7.30 *Airports Council International (ACI) Airport Carbon Accreditation Scheme* - the Committee noted that the Airport continued to progress its commitments as part of the ACI Airport Carbon Accreditation Scheme. Its Sustainability Statement outlined the commitment to support LBB's intention to become carbon neutral by 2029. The Airport was continuing to progress a range of environmental measures including transfer to a green tariff for energy provision, improved recycling targets, increased utilisation of electrically powered vehicles, a site-wide switch to LED lights and investigations into a wider use of photovoltaic panels.

## **8. Progress report on the review of the Noise Action Plan (NAP)**

- 8.01 Referring to paragraphs 7.44 - 7.50 of its minutes of the last meeting held on 29 July 2021, the Committee received a report that reminded members that, as part of the Deed of Variation to amend

the Airport's operating hours in 2017, the Airport had agreed to undertake a review of the Noise Action Plan every 5 years. The first review had been completed on 12 July 2021. It was noted that, after consultation through Safety and Noise Abatement Review Board (SANARB), Noise and Safety Sub-Committee, this Committee and LBB, the Airport's final version had been submitted to LBB on 19 August.

- 8.02 The report advised that the Airport acknowledged the need to actively update the community on the continual improvements being implemented by the Airport. The CEO was keen to improve and enhance engagement at all levels and had decided to introduce quarterly update reports to this Committee on improvements to the NAP. In response to a suggestion from the Chairman, the CEO confirmed that the update reports would be published well in advance of the Committee's meetings.
- 8.03 The report was the first of these updates and it highlighted some specific actions and set out more information about them. They were explained and further information was provided by the CEO during his presentation of the report. These actions were in relation to the following:
- Air Space Change Proposals - the changes are referred to in paragraphs 7.13 – 7.15, 7.17 – 7.18 and 7.22 above;
  - Accuracy of Webtrak - it was noted that LBB had observed the trials and concluded that the evidence that the Airport had provided did not suggest that there were any significant inaccuracies in the Webtrak system. LBB was encouraging the Airport to publicise the actions it had taken to increase understanding of, and confidence in, the system's accuracy;
  - Helicopter Operations - the Airport, in association with LBB, had commenced a dialogue with Castle Air to clarify helicopter procedures and work with the operator regarding the use of navigational guidance equipment such as SkyDemon VFR (Visual Flight Rules) software;
  - Online and web based briefing material - to improve engagement with residents and enhance understanding of Airport operating procedures, the Airport has started the production of an on-line and web-based briefing material that will cover the use and operation of Webtrak, noise preferential routes, noise sensitive areas and other Airport operating procedures. These enhancements would allow residents to see the work undertaken by the Airport in meeting its commitments as a good neighbour.
- 8.04 During the discussions of these actions, the Committee referred to previous debates about the accuracy of WebTrak and the CEO mentioned that some airports were requiring pilots to use SkyDemon so that accuracy of movements can be proved. The Chairman advised that the software was a sophisticated system that the CAA accepts as accurate and valuable. However, it was suggested that the system may have some deficiencies. Councillor Martin Allen commented that the accuracy of WebTrak had still not been ascertained so far as Tatsfield was concerned because the reconciliation exercise referred to in paragraphs 7.48 - 7.50 of the minutes of the Committee's meeting held on 29 July 2021 had not yet been undertaken. He asked when it would be taking place and the CEO undertook to arrange for it to happen with the cooperation of the Tatsfield councillors within the two weeks following the meeting.
- 8.05 In advance of the meeting members of the Committee had been provided by *Flightpath Watch* with a copy of its letter dated 12 October 2021 to the Leader of LBB and report on the review of the NAP. At the end of the meeting under Any Other Business further reference was made to the report and the CEO indicated that, since the covering letter had been addressed to the Leader of the Council, the Airport had no intention of responding. Richard Parry mentioned that he had been grateful to receive the report as it had helped him to understand the issue. The Committee agreed that the issues raised in the *Flightpath Watch* report were matters to be resolved between LBB and the Airport.
- 8.06 Any comments received about the NAP and the outcome of the review will be brought to the attention of future meetings of this Committee.

## 9. Proposed revision to the User Clause

- 9.01 Referring to paragraphs 7.34 - 7.40 of its minutes of the last meeting held on 29 July 2021, the Committee received a report that advised that until 2002 the Airport was able to allow scheduled services with up to a maximum of 25 seats. These services were described as “an aircraft that departs in accordance with a printed timetable and carries fare paying passengers.” The Airport’s licence from the CAA allows for public transport of passengers and many passengers pass through the Airport each day. However, since 2002, no passengers are permitted if they have paid a fare. BHAL believes that Airport tenants and users and members of the community who used to be able to use a range of small flights regard that as an unreasonable restraint of trade.
- 9.02 The report advised that operators were keen to make best use of their investments, their aircraft and their crews. BHAL believed that it would be sensible for the lease to allow for seats to be sold within managed conditions. It was expected that some operators would want to provide one-off flights to events and a few operators might try to provide more frequent services and that no more than 10% of the Airport’s flights would be involved. It was possible that it may even help to reduce the number of flights needed. The report assured members that the existing noise regulations and the physical and technical limitations of the airfield would not enable it to be an airport for mainline passenger services.
- 9.03 It was noted that BHAL had held a series of meetings with LBB officers about the request to be able to reintroduce fare-paying passengers on shared business jet services but that ultimately the Council had rejected the application. As the Landlord was unwilling to make an affirmative decision, BHAL could apply to the Lands Tribunal for an independent decision. The CEO advised, however, that BHAL wished to avoid the decision being made by a third party if an agreement would be reached. He added that the Airport was unsuitable for use for big, regular scheduled movements such as those that take place at, for example, Heathrow or Gatwick airports. It was important that the application should be seen as more like a minibus service and should not be seen as being a lever to enable that outcome to occur. Even if BHAL wanted to pursue that outcome, which it did not, the economics of providing holiday flights by companies such as easyJet would be prohibitive. The costs of providing the required facilities would be enormous and the Airport was sited in an area with poor infrastructure.
- 9.04 Set out in the report were alternative options for a revised User Clause, together with the existing one currently in force and the Committee was asked to consider two new options so that BHAL could move forward, hopefully with a mutually agreed draft for discussion with the Landlord.
- 9.05 In answer to questions the CEO advised that:
- it was anticipated that most shared services would only have space for between 4 + 10 fare-paying passengers using aircraft such as the PC12, PC 24 or any other types already using and complying with the Airport’s regulations;
  - the proposal would put Biggin Hill Airport on the same basis as other airports;
  - the difference between the two options was that option 1 set a maximum of 30 passengers on any commercial flight with the fare paying passengers, whilst option 2 had the same limitation and took the opportunity to add the other types of flights that already use the Airport, such as military and other airport and aviation related uses, e.g., small cargo;
  - the proposal would be welcomed by existing operators and one new operator would possibly have already had a base at the Airport if shared services had been permitted;
  - there were approximately 39,000 movements in 2019, well within the number allowed;
  - if permitted the flights would be corporate jet, corporate twin or helicopter movements;
  - the possible charging of a passenger duty would be the responsibility of the operator;
  - there was a demand for shared flights and now was a propitious time for the issue to be considered and for the initiative to be introduced.
- 9.06 Members made the following comments:

- the use of the term ‘commercial’ in relation to flights suggests operators such as easyJet and Ryanair and emphasising terms such as ‘smaller aircraft’ would sound less threatening to local people.
  - the options should include a clear explanation of what types of movements would be excluded.
  - the proposal seemed to be very similar to the proposed use of the Airport approved by the Council in 1991.
  - the proposals have not yet been seen by members of LBB who make its decisions and a briefing for councillors should be arranged at which an operator should be available to explain why it supports the proposal. It was suggested that, if available, the information material referred to in the fourth bullet point in paragraph 8.03 above should be used at the briefing.
  - the Airport needs to be wary about allowing aircraft to use the Airport; BA aircraft that land there always stimulate negative responses and rumours particularly on social media.
  - the Airport needs to make greater use of social media and other measures to help the Airport’s image to quash any uninformed rumours.
- 9.07 The Chairman gave the Committee the opportunity to decide on whether to vote or if it had any objection the proposal at this meeting. Peter Osborne advised that he would like to have the matter discussed at the next meeting of the BRF and it was agreed that such a vote would be deferred. Later in the meeting Peter Osborne undertook to feed back to the Chairman the outcome of the BRF discussion.
- 9.08 In the meantime, it was noted that from the information now available, it appeared that the majority of members of the Committee currently saw no reason why the proposal should not be adopted. It was agreed that a briefing note would be provided by the Airport by email before the next meeting and that it would be considered again at the next meeting.
- 9.09 NB. The Committee noted that Matthew Amer had taken no part in the presentation or discussion of this item.

## **10. Noise contours**

- 10.01 The CEO reported on the quarterly report produced by Bickerdike Allen Partners LLP (BAP) about the noise contour maps that were referred to in the CEO’s report and which were tabled.
- 10.02 It was noted that, for the daytime and early morning periods both contour areas were well within the areas prescribed. There had been 44 movements during the late evening period (10 - 11pm), with a maximum of 3 movements in a single late evening period which occurred on three individual days. There had been 63 movements during the early morning period (6.30 - 7pm), with a maximum of 6 movements on 1 September. For both periods this was fewer than the limit of 8 movements in a single late evening or early morning period, excluding military movements.
- 10.03 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 km<sup>2</sup> and reasonable endeavours were to be used to keep it no more than 2.9 km<sup>2</sup>. The area for the quarter’s contour was less at 2.3 km<sup>2</sup>.
- 10.04 For the late evening period reasonable endeavours were to be used to keep the contour area at no more than 1.3 km<sup>2</sup>. The area for this contour was less at 0.3 km<sup>2</sup>. For the early morning period reasonable endeavours were to be used to keep the area no more than 2.2 km<sup>2</sup>. The area for the contour was lower at 0.8 km<sup>2</sup>.
- 10.05 The summary of the BAP report advised that the analysis indicated that the Airport had operated in accordance with the NAP.



## **11. Report by the Chairman of the Noise and Safety Sub-Committee**

- 11.01 The report of the Flight Evaluation Unit for the third quarter of 2021 had been tabled at the meeting. It showed that during the three months there had been 14,163 movements at the Airport compared 11,599 in the same quarter of 2020.
- 1102 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 map that plotted the areas from which the complaints/comments had emanated;
  - 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.
- 11.03 Richard Parry's report advised that, including automatically identified track deviations, there had been a total of 160 incidents/complaints. One person had reported 45 incidents, another 26 and a further seven people were responsible for putting in 46 reports. 43 of the incidents/complaints had been individually submitted.
- 11.04 It was noted that 13 of the complaints, all of which were track deviations and 24 automatically detected track deviations had been referred to SANARB and that 37 minor infringement notices had been issued. 89 safety occurrences of which 41 mandatory occurrence reports had been submitted to the CAA. Many of the latter identified aircraft unserviceability.
- 11.05 During his presentation of the report, Richard Parry advised that:
- there had been no noise violations;
  - there had been an increase in the number of incidents of debris on the runway;
  - with reference to the exercise referred to in paragraph 8.04 above, the sub-committee had arranged the accuracy of WebTrak to be checked to the north of the Airport as well.
- 11.06 The Chairman asked Richard Parry about:
- when sub-committee meetings were held and whether they could be held earlier so that the report could be circulated in advance of the date of Biggin Hill Airport Consultative Committee (BHACC) meetings. He was informed that the most recent had started at 11.45am on the same day as the BHACC meeting. The reason for that being the customary practice was because it made the best use of members' and officers' time.
  - whether the sub-committee's minutes were published on the Airport's website and Richard Parry confirmed that they were.
  - whether any action was taken in respect of people who submitted numerous complaints. He was advised that they can be classed as vexatious complainants in which case they would be informed that they would not be receiving responses to their complaints. However, the Airport preferred to attempt to have a dialogue with such complainants to try to deal with their issues. Currently, there were no complainants that were being regarded as vexatious.
  - the recording of complaints. He was advised that separate complaints about the same issue and relating to the same movement were recorded as separate complaints. The Airport and the sub-committee had no wish to discourage genuine complaints.
- 11.07 Councillor Melanie Stevens commented that it was surprising that there had been complaints from the Keston and Farnborough areas. In answer to a related question from John High the Committee was informed that the movements were related to Keston village rather than the area.
- 11.08 Referring to paragraph 11.03 above, Councillor Martin Allen said that 26 of the complaints had been submitted by him and that none of them had been found to be infringements. He asked how it was possible for noise complaints to be found to be not substantiated when no noise monitor was sited at the location. The CEO replied that the complainant's categorisation of the complaint is accepted and that there are fixed noise monitors stationed at each end of the runway. Using the height of the aircraft and its specifications and whether procedures were being followed, a

calculation can be made on the noise output. Matthew Amer mentioned that the Airport sometimes offers complainants the opportunity of having a noise monitor sited at their property and that a number had been so sited. The CEO advised that one was currently on such a site and, in answer to a question and suggestion from the Chairman, he advised that they are normally sited for eight weeks and that consideration would be given as to whether to obtain additional monitor(s).

11.09 Councillor Martin Allen and Deva Ponnosami left the meeting during the discussion outlined in the preceding paragraph (at 4.55pm).

## 12. Planning issues

12.01 Paul Mellor reported that:

- introduction of the Government's planning reforms had currently been halted and that it was likely that less radical changes would replace them;
- the permitted development rights revision to allow the change of use in England from any use from the Commercial, Business and Service use class (Class E) to residential use (Class C3) had been introduced;
- the Local Plan review had begun and was in the 'call for sites' stage. The review process would take three years and would probably not be completed before 2024/25;
- the Council's new Community Infrastructure Levy which would provide financial contributions from certain types of development to help fund new or improved strategic infrastructure was to be adopted in January;
- a minor material amendment planning application for the hotel had been approved (see paragraph 7.25 above);
- Gatwick Airport was now consulting on proposals to bring the northern runway into use alongside the main runway. He advised that the Airport could liaise with LBB about making any representations if it wished.

## 13. Community Relations

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

13.02 There were no comments on the press items.

## 14. Any other business

14.01 Publication of the Committee's minutes – Matthew Amer said that some residents have asked whether it would be possible for the Committee's minutes to be published on the Airport's website sooner. Members were reminded that the normal practice was for minutes not to be finalised and made public until they had been approved at the next meeting. That had been this Committee's practice until a revised procedure had been agreed at the meeting held on 25 April 2019.

14.02 The current practice is that, once the Chairman was content that the minutes accurately represented what had occurred at the meeting, they would be circulated by email to members with a view to them being able to suggest amendments. These would need to be made to the Secretary within set a time limit. Subject to the approval by the Chairman of any suggested amendments, the minutes would be posted on the website as the final version and signed at the next meeting.

14.03 The Secretary undertook to try and have them available on the website within a month of the meeting.

14.04 Flightpath Watch – as mentioned in paragraph 8.05 above, reference was made at this point in the meeting to the report from *Flightpath Watch*.

**15. Dates of next meetings**

- 15.01 The Committee was reminded that it had been agreed that the next meeting would be held at 3pm on Thursday, 27 January 2022 (following the Annual General Meeting).
- 15.02 It was agreed that the subsequent meetings in 2022 would be held at 3pm on the following dates:
  - o Thursday, 28 April 2022;
  - o Thursday, 28 July 2022;
  - o Thursday, 27 October 2022.

The meeting closed at 5.15pm.