

London City Airport Consultative Committee



3D1946SI/sv

c/o LDDC
Unit A
Great Eastern Enterprise
Millharbour
London E14 9TJ

MINUTE of the meeting held on Wednesday 25th January 1989 at London City Airport.

PRESENT	John Adshead	Chair
	Stuart Innes	Hon. Secretary
	Dru Vesty	LDDC
	Lewis Moss	LDDC
	Bill Lindsell	London City Airport
	Bruce Unsted	London City Airport
	Peter Dallaway	London City Airways
	Tony Auld	Brymon Airways
	Graham Hall	PLA
	Cllr Julie Garfield	LBN
	Cllr Stephen Timms	LBN
	Noel Edwards	Beckton Residents Assoc.
	Bill Dunlop	Andrew Street TA
	Ann Batchelor	Thameside TA
	Arthur Cattell	Drew Road Tenants & Residents Assoc.
	Roy Featherstone	ABTA
	David Reynolds	GBTA
	Alan Turner	DBC
	Anne Jermy	London Chamber Commerce
IN ATTENDANCE	Robert Simpson	LBN - Environment Health Dept
	Chris Platt	London City Airport
	Cllr Bill Chapman	LBN
APOLOGIES	Bert Pile	Northside TH
	Jonathan Wilson	London City Airways
	Clive Arrow	PLA
	Peter Mitchell	London City Airways
	Cllr Norman Adams	Greenwich LBC

1. PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF THE LTMA

The Committee received a NATS paper explaining their proposals for the revision of the boundaries of the London Terminal Control Area (LTMA) in the vicinity of Detling in Kent.

Chris Platt, Manager, Air Traffic Services at London City Airport attended the meeting to explain the present ATC regime in which the airport operates and the effect which these new NATs proposals would have on these arrangements. In his view the proposals, which would allow flights to and from LCY direct and assured access to controlled air space, were to be welcomed on operational grounds but, more particularly, they represented a dramatic improvement in terms of flight safety.

In answering questions from members Mr Platt indicated:

- That the proposals would have a significant effect on light aircraft, gliding and parachuting interests in Kent insofar that in the areas concerned they would have to fly lower than hitherto. They had no formal "established user" rights over this air space but it was important that these interests should be consulted about the effect of the changes on their operations before the CAA exercised its right to impose control. They would, no doubt, object to the proposals claiming that the changes would prevent or restrict their operations.
- That the Cross Channel SRZ had been established many years ago to provide a controlled route for low level car ferries crossing the English Channel. These services had long since ceased to operate and this airspace could now be safely decontrolled.
- That Thames Radar tries very hard to accommodate helicopter and light aircraft in the vicinity of LCY. However, all such traffic is obliged to call the Thames controller by radio before entering the SRZ and to follow his instructions. This traffic is, therefore, under positive radar control and proper separation can be secured.
- That although aircraft approaching LCY could not normally be "seen" by Thames Radar below 500 feet, such traffic was by then within a mile of the airport and, accordingly, this caused no difficulty in practice.
- That when the proposed changes at Detling are implemented, new proposed routings would be introduced with all departures from LCY turning to the north-east. Traffic heading to the south-east, south and west would then turn southwards for Detling at a point to the north east of the airport. These new routes would in some cases involve an addition to journey times since longer distances would have to be flown.
- That holding/reporting point for inbound traffic was likely to be located to the south-east of the airport probably in the vicinity of Swanley.
- That the new arrangements would mean that aircraft leaving LCY would climb higher more quickly and this should be a benefit for residents. The fact that these aircraft would now be operating wholly within controlled air space would mean improved safety not only for passengers but also for those living under the routes which they follow.
- That the new arrangements were a first step in the proposed Combined Control Function (CCF) arrangements about which the Committee had heard from NATS last year.

Stephen Timms indicated that the LBN were concerned that these proposals might contribute to an intensification in the use being made of the airport but that the proposals were important in terms of flight safety and on these grounds they should be supported.

Bill Lindsell on behalf of the Airport, and Tony Auld and Peter Dallaway for the airlines, indicated their strong support for the proposals.

The Committee AGREED unanimously that these proposals should be supported and the Honorary Secretary was asked to write accordingly to the Civil Aviation Authority.

[Action - SWI]

2. MINUTE OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14 DECEMBER, 1988

Agreed.

3. MATTERS ARISING

(a) Condition of Roads

Dru Vesty said that it was the clear responsibility of the contractors to ensure that their vehicles left the working sites in a clean condition. Meetings have been arranged with them to ensure that they had proper facilities for this purpose and to impress on them the need for these to be used.[A letter subsequently received from the LDDC on this matter is attached]

Councillor Garfield said that there had been no improvement in practice and that many roads in the area were now very slippery and dangerous. It was her impression that many of the lorries were overloaded and it was small wonder that they spilt mud on the roads.

Other members referred to the particularly bad conditions to the north of the Airport where works vehicles crossed from one side of the Connaught Road to the other in the vicinity of the Connaught Hotel. Arrangements had been made for site staff to clean these vehicles before they crossed but in practice they appeared to be overwhelmed.

Two other points of concern were:-

- At the junction of Connaught Road with Albert Road and the Silvertown By-pass where heavy vehicles turning were often found to be on the "wrong" side of the road. Some attention to the layout of the junction might help to solve the difficulties here.
- At the junction of Woolwich Road with Silvertown By-pass (opposite Thomas Ward's) where part of the road is closed for works and the lighting is very poor.

Dru Vesty said she would raise these particular instances with the London Borough of Newham.

[ACTION - DV]

Ann Batchelor referred to the frequent danger in that section of Connaught Road now subject to one way shuttle working controlled by signals. Drivers sometimes "jumped" the lights and met vehicles coming in the opposite direction.

Dru Vesty said that the various road works now in progress in the area could be expected to last for at least another twelve/eighteen months but she would bring to the next meeting of the Committee a schedule and drawings showing the works in more detail. These would include details of the temporary traffic arrangements which in some instances would be required to facilitate the works.

[ACTION - DV]

Bill Lindsell said that the Joint Committee referred to at the last ACC meeting would be meeting on a monthly basis to monitor road works in progress or proposed and to try where possible to secure coordination. It would be publishing regular information for drivers and residents similar to that produced by the LDDC for the Isle of Dogs.

(b) Secondary glazing - removal of frames

Bill Lindsell reported that the London Borough of Newham had given their permission for the removal of these frames and, in fact, those at No.6 Camel Road had already been taken out. This had caused some damage which would be made good in the near future.

[ACTION BL]

In relation to No 10 Drew Road the Airport had been informed that the tenant was content for the frames to remain. Arthur Cattell said that the new tenant at this address was an elderly lady who was said to be reluctant to let people into her home. This might explain her reluctance to have the frames removed. Bill Lindsell said the frames could be left in place or removed as the tenant wished. Arthur Cattell said he would try to speak to the tenant and let Bill Lindsell know the outcome.

[ACTION - AC]

(c) Snooker table for young people

Bill Dunlop and Arthur Cattell confirmed that the grant promised by the LDDC had now been received. This would be used to purchase balls and other equipment for a secondhand pool table which had been refurbished and would be installed shortly.

5. AIR TRANSPORT USERS COMMITTEE (AUC)

The Committee noted the extracts from the Annual Report of this organisation which had been circulated with the Agenda.

6. NOISE INSULATION

Mr Richardson of 56 Parker Street, and his neighbours Mr and Mrs Elliott of 54 Parker Street, attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

Owner occupiers had received a letter from the airport saying that they would be offered secondary glazing, or appropriate double glazing, to the same standard as that to be installed in the homes of tenants. But it was not yet clear what precisely the tenants had been offered? During a recent meeting for tenants, at which they had been shown the agreed system of double glazing, it had been said that this would not be offered to owner occupiers. Owner occupiers who had already installed double glazing, or would now make their own arrangements to do so, were also concerned to know how long it would be before payments would be made to them.

Bill Lindsell apologised for the misunderstanding. He confirmed that the provision to be made for owner-occupiers would be the same as that agreed by the London Borough of Newham for the homes of tenants. The problem was that the Airport had not yet received the specification which the Council had agreed with Anglia Windows. As soon as this was to hand they would write again to owner occupiers without delay. He hoped this would not be long. He expected that photographs of the system to be used would be available within a week or so.

[ACTION BL]

Where owners had already installed double glazing it would need to be inspected by the Airports noise consultant to ensure that it met the agreed specification in terms of noise insulation. If so, arrangements would be made with the owner for early payment.

Where owners wished to install a system of their own choosing they would need to contact the Airport in advance to check whether the chosen system meets the noise insulation requirements. If so, approval would be given and arrangements made with the owner for payment.

In response to a question, Bill Lindsell said that it was his belief that all the windows in the affected properties, except those in south-facing elevations, would be replaced by the new double glazed units. He was not clear whether the windows of the bathrooms and toilets were to be replaced but confirmed that whatever was agreed with the Borough Council for the homes of tenants would be likewise be offered to owner-occupiers. Roger Simpson of the LBN said he would check the council's intentions on these matters and tell Bill Dunlop the position. Likewise he would try to get some indication of when the works could be expected to start and how long they would take to complete. He understood that this would depend to some extent on a decision still to be taken as to how much asbestos near these windows should be stripped. He was not at this stage sure whether the opportunity would be taken to carry out other maintenance or improvement work when the windows were installed. He would advise on this point.

[ACTION - RS]

In response to a query by Councillor Garfield, Dru Vesty said that the grant promised by the LDC for entryphones for the flats to the south of the airport did not include provision for any wider refurbishment of these dwellings. She understood that the Council might at some stage ask the Corporation for help with a wider refurbishment scheme but, so far, nothing had been received. Councillor Garfield mentioned that the entryphones had still to be installed. The delay arose from a need to renew/refurbish the doors to the flats.

Lewis Moss said the important step now was for the double glazing specification to be finalised and supplied to the Airport. This ought not to be delayed by other works which the Council might be contemplating in conjunction with the project to replace the windows.

6. AIRPORT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Bill Lindsell said that in operational terms the period since the last meeting had been comparatively uneventful. Until Christmas passenger load factors had been very good but since then, in common with the rest of the industry, there had been a seasonal lull which had been compounded to some extent by a number of foggy days which had restricted operations.

A complaint had been received from the London Borough of Newham about the use of the airport by twin engined aircraft. The Airport Director wished to make it clear that the airport could legitimately be used by the DHC-6 Twin Otter and by the Dornier 228, both of which were twin engined. Both aircraft had, in fact, used the airport on a number of occasions during the last few months of 1988. He denied categorically that the airport had been used by a Fokker Friendship but in response to a query from Councillor Garfield said that the CAA used an HS748 on a quarterly basis to calibrate the Instrument Landing System at the Airport. But it did not need to land and, in fact, it had never done so.

In relation to the recent well publicized incident at Locherbie Bill Lindsell said that the Airport had carried out a thorough review of its security arrangements which were shown to be satisfactory. The Airport would continue to keep these procedures under review and any steps required to ensure the safety of passengers would be taken.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Pollution

Anne Batchelor tabled a paper [copy attached] in which it is alleged that the Airport is discharging pollutants into the adjoining dock waters. Bill Lindsell said he would need time consider the paper but indicated that the Airport faced a problem in relation to its sewage in that there had been a very long delay in constructing the LDDC sewer to which the airport system was to be connected. Because of this the Airport, at its own expense, had installed on a temporary basis two pipelines to an existing sewer on the north side of the Royal Albert Dock. These had come into use at the beginning of the year and the airport was not now discharging into the docks. He drew attention to the fact that other contractors were engaged in works close to the docks and it was not beyond the bounds of possibility that their operations might be a source of pollution. He would discuss the matter with the LDDC and offer further comment at the next meeting.

[ACTION - BL]

(b) Water nuisance in Saville Road

Arthur Cattell referred to earlier discussions about water being discharged into Saville Road which appeared to be coming from the airport. On 15th December there had been a site meeting with Bruce Unsted but the problem persisted. Bruce Unsted said that the matter had been referred to his engineering colleagues for investigation but he was not yet in a position to offer any comment. As soon as the engineering report is received he would get in touch with Arthur Cattell and there would be a report to the Committee at its next meeting.

[ACTION - BU]

(c) North London Line

Ann Jermy said that at a recent meeting of the London Regional Passengers Committee there had been a report that the rolling stock on the North London Line is to be replaced. The replacement carriages would have sliding doors and more accommodation for passengers.

(d) Parker Street - Pedestrian Access

Arthur Cattell referred to a recent application by the Airport for planning permission to provide a pedestrian access between the airport and Parker Street. He said that such an access had in fact been in use since the airport was opened and asked for an explanation. He was informed by the Bill Lindsell that the application had been submitted to rectify an oversight in relation to this access. The original application had been for an emergency access and the requirement for a pedestrian facility had not been included.

(e) "Kids in Care" flights - 18 March 1989

Brymon Airways had allocated two Saturday morning flights over the East End for children in the care of the Borough Council and for children who found themselves frequently in hospital.

(f) Presentation on Airline Operations

It was suggested that the Committee might welcome such a presentation by the Airlines. Tony Auld and Peter Dallaway said they were sure this could be arranged and the Honorary Secretary was asked to liaise with them for such a presentation at a future meeting.

[ACTION SWI]

(g) Presentation on Airport Emergency Services & Procedures

At its next meeting the Committee were due to receive a presentation on the Airport Emergency Services and Procedures. The Newham Community Health Council had expressed an interest in this presentation and it was agreed to extend to them a warm invitation to attend the meeting. It was further agreed to invite a representative of the Newham Health Authority to participate in this presentation and explain the plans for dealing with emergencies at Newham General Hospital.

[ACTION - SWI]

8. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, 8th March 1989 at 7.00 p.m. in the Boardroom at London City Airport. The Agenda for the meeting would include the presentation on the Emergency Services already agreed.