

Memo

Date:
From: Mr Robin D Gordon
To: ACC members + web

Subject: Minutes of the Lydd Aerodrome consultative committee meeting held on the 10th August 2007 Lydd Aerodrome

Current members		<u>P</u>resent for this meeting
Mr Fred Wood – Brignall (FB)	X	Chairman Consultative Committee
Mr. Zaher Deir (ZD)	X	Lydd Airport Managing Director
Mr Robin Gordon (RG)	X	Lydd Airport Marketing Consultant
<i>Mr. Tim Maskens (TM)</i>		<i>Lydd Airport Senior ATCO</i>
Mr. Bernard Daly (BD)		Lydd Airport Aerodrome Manager
Mr Paul Fisher (PF)	X	Lydd Airport Fire Officer
Mr. Jason Oliver (JO)		Lydd Airport RFFS
<i>Ms. Jo Oliver (JOO)</i>		<i>Lydd Airport PRO</i>
<i>Ms Lisette Patching (LP)</i>		<i>Shepway DC</i>
William Richardson (WR)	X	Shepway District Councillor
Mr Terry Ellames (TE)	X	Shepway District Council
Mr Clive A Wire (CA)		New Romney Town Councillor
Mr. Denis Lawton (DL)		New Romney Town Councillor
Mr Chris E Albrow (CEA)		Independent
Mr Mike Walsh (MW)		Independent
Ms Marie Masters (MM)	X	Lydd NR Greatstone Residents Assoc
<i>Mr Chris Bell (CB)</i>		<i>British Energy (Dungeness)</i>
<i>Mr. Steve Pettit (SP)</i>		<i>British Energy (Dungeness)</i>
Lt Col Graham Duthoit (GD)	X	Lydd Ranges Deputy Commander
Ms Louise Barton (LB)	X	LAAG
<i>Mr. Phillip Carter(PC)</i>		<i>Michael Howard's Team Leader</i>
Mr John Commerford (JC)	X	Mayor of Lydd
Mr David Kersey (DK)	X	Lydd Town Councillor
Mr Tim Crompton (TC)	X	Acting Chair Friends of Lydd Airport Group

Ad hoc members in italics

- ✈ FB opened the meeting by welcoming new members and asking all to introduce themselves.
- ✈ No apologies for absence had been received.
- ✈ FB reviewed the minutes of the previous meeting and these were agreed as a true record.
- ✈ RG passed out model terms of reference for airport consultative committees and pointed out that these were available from the Lydd Airport web site.
- ✈ PF reviewed aerodrome operations. He made mention of the restructuring that had taken place stating that operational capabilities had not been impacted.
- ✈ FB asked ZD to comment on the restructuring

- ✈ ZD mentioned the delay in the planning application process of at least six months. Additional studies had also had to be commissioned. The airport was running at a loss. The current levels of staff could accommodate 4-5 airline movements a day but no movements were forthcoming. He stated that airlines needed clarity as to the proposed runway development. Even when planning applications were approved now it would take at least a year to 18 months to develop the runway length. These delays had caused the redundancies and merging of some departments. These changes had not caused any loss of operational capability. He stressed he was not happy regarding the situation.
- ✈ FB commented that he had only heard about the redundancy in papers. He was aware that a lot of money had been spent on the EIA and wondered what was causing the delay. He thought all areas had been covered.
- ✈ ZD commented that a difference of opinion existed between consultants; That some of the statutory consultees had behaved in a tactical manner, awaiting publication of information and then requesting further information, information that should have been specified during the scoping process. He stated that over three and a half years of work had been completed by highly skilled consultants. That these members had experience of working on many other airports. Those efforts had been hampered in the case of Natural England (NE) by lack of staff (at NE).
- ✈ RG mentioned a comment from the Stop Stansted Airport campaign to the effect that the developer, BAA, had commented that additional research was not needed (for Stansted) as matters would be sorted out at public enquiry and pointed out the very differing attitude of Lydd Airport. Whenever additional information had been requested this had been commissioned, as research, and provided.
- ✈ LB commented that the EIA was inadequate.
- ✈ TE stated that details of the EIA had been submitted with the planning application and that these, for Shepway District Council (SDC), had been available for the first time in December. No one at SDC had looked at the work prior to submission.
- ✈ ZD commented that perhaps SDC had not seen the work (EIA) but the airport consultants (Parsons Brinkerhoff) had worked throughout the run up to the application with, among others, RSPB and NE. That RSPB had, at the same time as the application had been filed, issued a press release against the airport showing that whilst they went through the consulting and scoping process they were in principle opposed to the development of the airport.
- ✈ TE overviewed the application (for development of Lydd). The application had been submitted immediately prior to Christmas. It had been tackled in the early part of the New Year. Public consultation was started in March. Consultation had been put in hand with statutory consultees (not including the Health & Safety Executive (HSE) at the same time and direct comments had been received from some 3,000 people and organisations including 24 – 26 statutory bodies. The statutory bodies had, for the most part, requested more information.
- ✈ FB asked what sort of information had been requested.
- ✈ TE answered that the environment had been a key issue with Kent County Council seeking clarification of a number of points. He went on to say that these issues could not be resolved between the consultants acting for the airport and for SDC; that the points raised had been for the airport to respond to. SDC had re commissioned consultants to review the revised information. If NE and KCC continued to request further information

this put SDC in a difficult position. SDC would try to come to a view on the validity of the additional information requested in late August. He went on to mention the importance of the impact on the community, especially the economic impact. He stated that South East of England Development Agency (SEEDA) was lukewarm to the development and that this had not helped the airports case. He felt that it was in the airports interest to get positive support from both SEEDA and Ashford Borough Council (ABC). He felt that both NE and KCC had to have a reasonable level of information on the mitigation of damage to the environment to support the development. He felt that LAA had one more opportunity to provide this key information to consultants before the application was determined, seeking to have these bodies on side.

- ✈ FB asked why SEEDA and KCC were not supportive. He speculated that these might be delaying tactics.
- ✈ TE commented that most major planning applications took some considerable time to resolve. That if a view was taken at this time (without fuller information) the planning advice from SDC planning department would be against the development.
- ✈ JC asked if it was anticipated that SDC would determine the application.
- ✈ TE commented that only developments of national or regional significance would, in the normal way, be called for determination by The Secretary of State. He felt that given the airports size that it was possible or probable that the development would be determined locally. He also pointed out that if, for example, NE felt the development had an impact on key sites this could have an impact on the process. He also commented on the possible view that the HSE may take, again stating that this could have an impact on such thinking. In short he stated that anything that was affected by the development outside of the local area had the power to initiate the decision being called in. He mentioned decisions regarding the sustainability of development at Coventry airport.
- ✈ JC again asked if the decision would be taken locally.
- ✈ TE stated that the secretary of state would determine if the development impacted on regional or national issues. That the first step would be for SDC to come to a view.
- ✈ TC wondered if RSPB & NE had used the requests for further information as a tactic and questioned just what they needed to prove.
- ✈ TE responded with detail on the ecology and bird issues, stating that SDC own consultants had requested more information on, among other issues, noise and the socio economic impact.
- ✈ TC was amazed at the time taken to decide that the airport would produce a positive economic impact.
- ✈ FB asked why TE was not involved in discussions with NE and RSPB.
- ✈ TS stated that SDC had commissioned consultants skilled in the various areas to look at the reporting. These consultants would then advise SDC.
- ✈ ZD commented that the first scoping action had been taken with SDC in 2004, identifying 20/30 items of reporting. These had been agreed with EN and RSPB. Extra studies and additional scoping had then been required causing a delay of over a year. SDC had then hired Bureau Veritas to act as consultants to appraise the reporting in the EIA. He made the point that consultants rarely agree, it being in their interests to find areas of debate. He went on to say that all information, even the negative reports produced by LAAG had

been assimilated and commented on in a formal manner. In all cases were more information had been asked for it had been supplied. He made mention of the geomorphology and the funding of a dig by Liverpool University. He felt that the ball was with SDC.

- ✈ TE stated that activity during August was modest given the holiday period. That information had been received on the 19th of July and that the reviewing of this had started promptly.
- ✈ ZD felt that SDC should take a stand on the matter pointing out the costs and delays that the round of consulting had cost.
- ✈ TE pointed out that SDC had not commissioned any consultants until the airport had responded with the additional requested data.
- ✈ WR pointed out that he was one of those who would decide the application and that it was the councillors, not the planning department at SDC who would determine the application. That councillors would vote based on the view of the electorate. Councillors could not read all of the EIA. He felt that much time had been wasted.
- ✈ JC accepted that more information would be needed before a recommendation could be given.
- ✈ TE was waiting for more information from the airport and he commented that these requests should be taken seriously by the developer. That based on the information that SDC had received to date he would be unable to make a positive recommendation,
- ✈ ZD commented that more information was due towards the end of September.
- ✈ TE mentioned that SDC would be required to issue notices in the press concerning the determination of the development given its highly controversial nature. He felt the statutory agencies may well take a month or so to come to a view on the further information once received.
- ✈ RG asked if there was a finite amount of time that the consultation could take.
- ✈ TE stated that a draft 106 agreement would be of benefit.
- ✈ LB stated that the noise profiles published by the airport were incorrect.
- ✈ FB asked if this was the case.
- ✈ ZD stated no, this was not the case, that the information was correct and asked LB to refute the data.
- ✈ LB stated that Lydd Airport Action Group (LAAG) had used top consultants.
- ✈ ZD pointed out that LB had been against the wind farm development and had used the same consultants, that the airport had teamed with local residents, SDC and the RSPB to oppose the wind farm development. Even the public enquiry had been held at the airport. He mentioned that information given out by LAAG was misleading, that approach procedures were designed by the UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). He mentioned the Global Express aircraft that had operated the previous weekend with the ranges in operation.
- ✈ GD asked about the operation of the power station.

- ✈ TE commented that the HSE were expected to return a view in September and that he continued to chase them.
- ✈ LB commented on the safety case for the operation of the power station, stating that the operator had to produce the case and it had, in turn, to be approved by the HSE.
- ✈ JC asked when a decision on the development might be made and what mechanism would be used.
- ✈ TE had given an original estimate of one year from application and he felt that this was realistic provided the airport submitted the further information in September.
- ✈ JC commented on the uncertainty the delay brought about and how this impacted on local residents as well as the airport. A general discussion ensued on this point.
- ✈ TE commented that the application was controversial and impacted many organisations. He again suggested the airport take a pro active approach toward some organisations who were luke warm to the development, particularly ABC and SEEDA. He commented that most of the economic development officers in SDC had a positive view of the development and that some agreement existed between the RSPB and KCC.
- ✈ ZD pointed out that SEEDA backed Manston due to the economic impact in Thanet, a seriously deprived area.
- ✈ JC asked if NE and SDC have had a meeting of minds?
- ✈ JC could see the process running for some time.
- ✈ TE mentioned that the public consultation period had ended and views taken.
- ✈ FB mentioned the positive impact the development would have in particular for young people.
- ✈ PF reviewed movement statistics for the airport:
 - ✈ Movements
 - ✈ May 1890 + 24% on 2006
 - ✈ Jun 2013 - 22% on 2006
 - ✈ July 2380 + 2% on 2006
 - ✈ Passenger numbers
 - ✈ 564 May + 22%
 - ✈ 726 June + 42%
 - ✈ 918 Jul + 1.5%
- ✈ Notable movements Global Express, same categorisation as a B737, one complaint.
- ✈ ZD pointed out that the aircraft was on a commercial charter.
- ✈ Noise complaints
 - March 11
 - April 8
 - May 2
 - June 1
 - July 10

- ✈️ RG commented on the close working relationship that existed with EN regarding habitat management on the aerodrome.
- ✈️ ZD gave a brief on the Lydd Air Show taking place on the 1st and 2nd of September. All was on track for a great show.
- ✈️ PF gave an update on the Rescue and Fire Fighting Service (RFFS). Development, on a self help basis, was ongoing with the new station facilities. The department was down slightly on numbers after restructuring having lost two trainees. 10 staff.
- ✈️ FB asked if the redundant fire fighter would be taken back on.
- ✈️ PF stated that this had already happened.
- ✈️ ZD commented on Phoenix Aircraft Engineering now with four engineers and two trainee/work experience staff. This was already attracting other aircraft to the airport for maintenance.
- ✈️ ZD updated the meeting on Hammonds Corner. New drawings had been prepared. Slow progress had been made with landowners (Christchurch College Oxford) and a design for a possible mini roundabout had been examined. This would not require land acquisition.
- ✈️ FB asked if the roundabout would be provided without the airports expansion.
- ✈️ ZD replied that no, it would in that case not be required.
- ✈️ RG gave an overview of the thinking on the compensation scheme.
 - Airport no wish to be residential landlord
 - Acting as buyer of last resort
 - Sound insulation (double glazing)
 - No single house in the noise contour
- ✈️ RG asked LB about the view that LAAG took and quizzed her on the policy of LAAG. LB stated that LAAG supported development within the existing runway but were against any extension to it. RG asked about support for the terminal given the run down state of the existing building stock.

There being no further business the date of the next meeting was set for Friday the 9th of November, 1400 at Lydd Airport.