

London City Airport Consultative Committee



MINUTE of the meeting held on Wednesday 27th April, 1988 at London City Airport

PRESENT	John Adshead	Chair
	Stuart Innes	Hon. Secretary
	Dru Vesty	LDDC
	John Douthwaite	LCY
	Nicholas Hopkins	John Mowlem & Co PLC
	Jonathan Wilson	London City Airways
	Capt. Peter Mitchell	London City Airways
	Tony Auld	Brymon Airways
	Ken Lund	LBN
	Cllr. Julie Garfield	LBN
	Cllr. Steven Timms	LBN
	Cllr. Norman Adams	LBG
	Clive Arrow	PLA
	Graham Hall	PLA
	Chris Miller	NDF
	Bert Pile	Northside TA
	Ann Batchelor	Thameside TA
	Bill Dunlop	Andrew Street TA
	David Reynolds	Guild of Business Travel Agents
	Roy Featherstone	ABTA
	Anne Jerney	London Chamber of Commerce
IN ATTENDANCE	Anne Crane	LDDC
	Dianne Sutton	LDDC

The Secretary had received a request from BBC Television to record part of the proceedings of the Committee. The Chair requested the views and instructions of the Committee. A vote was taken and it was CARRIED that permission to film was granted.

The Chair also asked whether there was any objection to Item 6 being discussed as the first item. A vote was taken and it was CARRIED that the item be brought forward.

1. Minute of meeting held on 24th February, 1988.

Agreed. It was noted that the attendance record had been amended.

2. Matters arising

(a) Noise Insulation Update

A letter circulated to affected residents by the London Borough of Newham in response to that sent by the Airport Director was tabled - copy appended hereto together with a copy of the LDDC letter referred to in paragraph 2.

Cllr. Timms indicated that he was most upset over the content of the Airport Director's letter. He wondered who had been responsible for the wording of the letter and who had taken the decision to despatch it. He had had discussions with the Solicitor to the Council who was of the opinion that in blaming the delay upon the Council the letter was defamatory. A letter had been sent to the Airport Director demanding the circulation of a retraction and apology. If this was not done the LBN would consider pursuing the matter through the courts.

The Airport Director confirmed that the Council's letter had been received that day. It had been referred to the Airport's legal advisers and he could not comment at this stage. He pointed out that Mowlem's had been under heavy criticism at the last meeting of the Committee and this had prompted the decision to establish the fund and despatch a letter to local residents.

Cllr. Timms asked how blaming the Council would help break the present impasse. The Airport Director explained that they were anxious to discharge their legal obligations under the Section 52 Agreement. The matter of the delays caused by Mowlems over mechanical ventilation was also raised by Cllr. Timms. Mr. Hopkins replied that not all the experts had agreed with the Borough that this was needed.

Mr. Lund reported that he had received a similar letter from Roger Sainsbury (Mowlems). No time had been allowed for him to respond to the allegations of delay before the letter to residents had been despatched. He drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the letter had been despatched without reference to or consultation with the Consultative Committee.

Cllr. Garfield stated that several meetings had taken place with tenants, the Corporation and Mowlems and that the glazing being offered to tenants had been rejected by them as unsuitable. This was supported by Ann Batchelor. The Airport Director said the specification agreed by the experts was considered to be the most appropriate in terms of noise insulation.

Mr. Dunlop asked whether the tenants as well as owner occupiers could waive their rights under the Section 52 Agreement to enable them to choose noise insulation which, while it might be less efficient in noise insulation terms, would be more acceptable to those affected.

The Chair asked whether the Committee could help in progressing the issue to a satisfactory conclusion. He wondered whether it was possible for a new Section 52 Agreement to be made enabling the parties to discharge their obligations in a manner considered more suitable by those affected.

Chris Miller proposed that the Committee should write to Mowlem's in support of the Borough's demand for a retraction and apology. A vote was taken and the proposal was CARRIED with 6 in favour, none against and 15 abstentions.

{ACTION - SWI}

2. (b) Fumes Nuisance

John Douthwaite reported back on the request from Cllr. Garfield for a fuel analysis. He referred to research carried out by Dr. Lowe at Heathrow, an extract of which is given below:

EXTRACT FROM ENERGY RESEARCH CARRIED OUT BY DR. LOWE 1975 WHILE AT BRUNEL UNIVERSITY

Ambient level hydrocarbons associated with kerosene range have been measured, both on and around Heathrow Airport. The results have been compared with data from major international cities as well as local town centres.

Average hydrocarbon levels are not any higher in concentration when one moves away from the runway than those levels found in cities.

Indeed the most polluted environments sampled were local town centres for example, Slough and Ealing.

However, the exhaust hydrocarbons in the kerosene range i.e. N-C9-14 are not found to any large extent in city or town air and this must ultimately prove significant.

NOTE: There is a further report in the London Scientific Survey Report dated 1984-86 on monitoring carried out at Heathrow.

Cllr. Garfield was not satisfied with the above report and requested that the Borough's Environmental Health Officers should undertake tests. Ken Lund agreed to investigate this possibility.

[ACTION - KL]

(c) Security Fencing

The Airport Director apologised for the lack of action regarding the returns to the fencing in Parker Street. The Contractors would be pressed to carry out the works without further delay.

[ACTION - JD]

3. Items for Information

(a) ABTA Membership - deputy noted.

(b) Eurocity Express change of name - noted

Cllr. Timms wished to place on record his appreciation that London City Airways had attended a meeting of Newham Employment and Disability Group to discuss the employment of disabled people.

(c) Letter from New Town Tenants Association - the correspondence was noted.

(d) A13 and LCY - the correspondence was noted.

David Reynolds said delays were still being experienced along the A13 at Salmon Lane because the width of the road is restricted for no obvious reason. Stuart Innes would investigate. Nicholas Hopkins reported on the River Bus service to be operated by Thames Line to provide a reliable link for passengers between the Airport and Central London. Mr. Dunlop also reported that LBL would be operating a scheduled bus service to the Airport.

(e) Woolwich Ferry - the correspondence was noted.

5. Guidelines for Airport Consultative Committees

Paper noted.

6. Demonstration of BAe 146

[Discussed as the first item]

The correspondence between the Corporation's Solicitors and Mowlems regarding the above were tabled. Dru Vesty said the LDDC's view was that the demonstration flights required planning permission. Mowlem had been advised of this and to allow time for such an application to be processed, they had been invited to postpone the demonstration flights planned for 15th May. The Airport Director said their legal advice was different and they believed the Airport were within their rights to arrange the demonstration of the BAe 146. However, they had deferred to the LDDC view and had postponed the demonstration. A planning application would now be submitted and Dru Vesty confirmed that the views of the Airport Consultative Committee would be welcome.

Bert Pile said that assurances had been given that jets would not operate out of London City. As it looked likely that an application would be made for jets to use the Airport, would helicopters likewise be permitted.

Cllr. Garfield registered her opposition to the operation of jets out of LCY.

Jonathan Wilson said there was little difference between the DASH-7 and a BAe 146 in terms of the power source used. He felt that the best way to allay the fears of local people would be to demonstrate the aircraft.

David Reynolds supported the use of this type of aircraft which he felt would be of benefit to airline operators and clients.

Cllr. Adams expressed the concerns of the Council and residents in Greenwich regarding low flying aircraft. He had strong reservations about the proposal.

Ken Lund observed that there had been a very extensive Public Inquiry and the Airport should abide by the decision of the Inspector. He would expect a democratic process to be carried through prior to any changes to the planning permission.

Nicholas Hopkins apologised that a leak of information to the press about the planned demonstration on 15th May had prevented prior consultation with the Committee. This was very much regretted.

Cllr. Timms asked why planning consents had not been sought before the demonstration was planned. The Airport Director re-iterated the Airport's view that this was not required.

Cllr. Adams was of the opinion that a Public Inquiry would be the best way forward for all parties concerned where all of these issues could be carefully explored.

The Chair observed that the present proposal was for a demonstration only, not for the use of jets. It was, therefore, premature to ask for a Public Inquiry at this stage.

Nicholas Hopkins informed the Committee of the successful demonstration of the DASH-7 at Heron Quay in 1982. The demonstration of the BAe 146 would be of the same nature. Comparisons between the aircraft would have been possible.

Chris Miller said that there was a difference now inasmuch that there were conditions governing the use of the Airport. The 1982 landings were on a redundant quayside on the Isle of Dogs. He felt that Mowlems were not taking this Committee seriously.

Bert Pile said that if the leak to the press had not happened, Members of the Committee would only have been informed of a demonstration only 18 days in advance.

Dru Vesty said that allowing 21 days for consultation on the application there should be time for the Committee to discuss this at the meeting scheduled for 25th May. Stuart Innes said that if the timing of the consultation process made it necessary, an extraordinary meeting of the Committee would be called.

[ACTION - SWI]

7. Airport Director's Report

The Airport Director reported on the new summer schedules - including the new service to Amsterdam - and explained a new car parking tariff with charges revised downwards. The new charges applying will be found appended hereto.

Bill Dunlop asked the Airport Director whether there was any notice on staff boards to prevent casual parking in Parker Street. John Douthwaite undertook to investigate, he had been unaware of any problem.

[ACTION - JD]

8. Any other business

Bert Pile asked whether members of the public could be allowed to address the Committee if prior notice through an elected representative had been given. This motion was seconded by Cllr. Garfield. A vote was taken and the proposal REJECTED.

Chris Miller felt this would be a major change and consideration of this request could perhaps be taken on board as part of the review of community representation. Jonathan Wilson seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the proposal was CARRIED.

Mr. Featherstone said that access arrangements to the Airport were still far from satisfactory, citing his own experience in trying to find a taxi at Stratford. There was a good deal of discussion among Members of the various different ways of reaching the Airport. Stuart Innes was requested to write to LRT asking them to include on the Tube map the section of the North London line between Stratford and Silvertown.

[ACTION - SWI]

9. Date of next meeting

25th May, 1988 at London City Airport at 7.00 pm.