

London City Airport Consultative Committee



MINUTE of the meeting held on Wednesday 10th August, 1988 at London City Airport.

PRESENT	John Adshead	Chair
	Stuart Innes	Hon. Secretary
	Jeff Hennessey	LDDC
	Bruce Unsted	London City Airport
	Nicholas Hopkins	John Mowlem & Co PLC
	Jonathan Wilson	London City Airways
	Peter Mitchell	London City Airways
	Tony Auld	Brymon Airways
	Andy Todd	Brymon Airways
	Clive Arrow	PLA
	Graham Hall	PLA
	Cllr. J. Garfield	LBN
	Cllr. S. Timms	LBN
	Bob Simpson	LBN
	Cllr. N. Adams	LBN
	Anne Jerney	London Chamber Commerce
	David Reynolds	Guild of Business TA
	Arthur Cattell	NDF
	Bill Dunlop	Andrew Street TA
	Anne Batchelor	Thameside TA
	Bert Pile	Northside TA
	Roy Featherstone	ABTA
IN ATTENDANCE	Dianne Sutton	London City Airways
APOLOGIES	Bill Lindsell	London City Airport
	Alan Turner	Docklands Business Club

1. MINUTE OF MEETING HELD ON 6TH JULY, 1988.

Agreed

2. MATTERS ARISING

(a) Noise Insulation

Jeff Hennessey reported that the LDDC and Mowlems had been investigating other types of window treatment. At the suggestion of the London Borough of Newham, a visit had been made to Little Ilford to see the installation there. A similar visit could be arranged for the residents affected if this was desired. There had also been consultation with the trade organisations to see if there were any other systems which might be suitable. It was hoped these studies would be completed in the near future. It was intended to put recommendations to the LDDC's Board at their September meeting.

Councillor Garfield reiterated that secondary glazing was unacceptable. It was the desire of residents to have installed in their homes the type of double glazing which had been installed in the Rathbone Street area. This was corroborated by Arthur Cattell.

Clive Arrow asked whether the use of the system installed at Rathbone Street had been costed. Jeff Hennessey estimated that the cost would be between two and three times more than that of secondary glazing, but there were no detailed figures.

Considerable disquiet was expressed by members over the continued delay in resolving this issue, and it was DECIDED that the Honorary Secretary should write to the LDDC, John Mowlems and the London Borough of Newham expressing the Committee's concern that there should be an early resolution of the issue. It would be suggested that the installation of the system in use at Rathbone Street should be costed, if only to establish the extra cost of installing the system favoured by residents.

[ACTION - SWI]

(b) Security Fencing

Bruce Unsted reported on behalf of the Airport Director that the fencing behind Drew Road had been improved in an attempt to prevent children gaining access between the boundary fencing and the wooden sound barrier within the Airport. It was hoped this would prove an adequate deterrent to the children. The Airport would monitor the situation to see if any further improvement to the fence is necessary.

Arthur Cattell pointed out that Chris Miller had at the last meeting raised the question of a particular system of security fencing which had been discussed at a site meeting some months ago. There had been no action on this. Bruce Unsted reiterated that works had been completed and that if the problem still persisted then the matter would be reviewed.

Several members indicated that there was still a problem over children and young people gaining access to this hidden area, and that they were a considerable nuisance. The police had been called on several occasions, but there had been no improvement. Bruce Unsted asked that the Duty Officer be contacted each time a problem arose so that the situation could be closely monitored.

Cllr. Garfield asked whether a site meeting could be held with the Housing Officers and three local Councillors concerned. It would also be helpful if the meeting could take place at 6.00 pm since the early evening period is considered to be the time when occurrences of this kind are most likely to happen. Bruce Unsted would action this request. Nicholas Hopkins thought the local Police and Crime Prevention Officers should also be invited to attend the meeting, this was AGREED.

[ACTION - BU]

Bill Dunlop asked whether the Airport security staff could be asked to give attention to this problem. Bruce Unsted said this would be considered in the context of the discussions which it had been agreed should be held.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Bill Dunlop moved that the present Chair, John Adshead, be elected. This was seconded by Cllr. Garfield and AGREED.

4. ELECTION OF HONORARY SECRETARY

Arthur Cattell moved that the present Honorary Secretary, Stuart Innes, be elected. This was seconded by David Reynolds and AGREED.

5. COMMITTEE EXPENSES

It was AGREED to accept the LDDC's offer to continue to fund the expenses of the Committee for a further year. The matter would be reviewed at the meeting to be held in August, 1989.

6. COMMITTEE MEMBER ATTENDANCE YEAR ENDED 6TH JULY, 1988.

Report noted

7. RENOMINATION OF MEMBERS

Nominations were still outstanding from the LDDC, the London Borough of Newham, and the Andrew Street Tenants Association. A letter had been received from the Beckton Residents Association which was read to the Committee. This suggested that Bert Pile should continue to represent the northern communities until the review of community representation later in the year. This was thought to be a sensible suggestion in the circumstances, and the Committee AGREED. Mike Heraty had been asked to contact the South Canning Town and Custom House Action Team about a deputy.

[ACTION - SWI]

Cllr. Garfield asked whether the tabled letter from Newham Docklands Forum could be dealt with at this point and this was AGREED.

The Committee were reminded that the constitution of the Consultative Committee is determined by Schedule 3 to the Section 52 planning agreement relating to the Airport. Already, by informal agreement, there had been an increase in the number of seats allocated to the community. If, however, a dramatic alteration in the balance of representation were to be proposed, the parties to the Section 52 Agreement would have to give their approval and, probably, the Agreement would need to be amended.

Cllr. Garfield told the meeting that she thought the principal purpose of the Committee should be to represent the interests of the community. On this basis she thought it inappropriate that those representing local people should find themselves in a minority. It was, however, pointed out that the Committee was actually set up to provide a forum which is representative of everyone concerned with the Airport - the Airport management, local authorities, airlines, Airport users, and the local community etc. Its purpose is to allow discussion of all matters concerning the Airport, not just local environmental issues. It is,

therefore, important that there should be a proper balance of representation with no particular group having a disproportionate influence. This view of the function and membership of the Committee is that embodied in the guidelines on Airport Consultative Committees issued by the Secretary of State for Transport and circulated recently to the Committee.

Feelings were expressed that it was, perhaps, unwise for the Committee, on issues such as the BAe 146 demonstrations, to take a vote and express a single view of the matter. Rather, perhaps, the Committee needs to try to depict the range of views represented at the meeting concerned.

The Committee were reminded that they have on a number of occasions expressed concern over its size. To allow it to grow much more would make it unwieldy and less effective. However, there had been discussions in the past over the possibility that the Committee might set up two sub-committees dealing with environmental and passenger services matters. As yet, though, it had not been thought appropriate to adopt this approach.

At it's last meeting, on 6th July, the Committee had agreed that later this year there should be a full review of the manner in which the seats allocated to the community are filled. The Committee accordingly DECIDED to hold over any further discussion on the question of community representation until the agreed review has been completed.

8. A13 COMMERCIAL ROAD/SALMON LANE - TRAFFIC RESTRICTION

The reply from the Department of Transport was unsatisfactory in that it showed no sense of urgency. The Honorary Secretary would again write expressing the Committee's view that the works should be carried out, and the restrictions removed, without avoidable delay.

[ACTION - SWI]

9. UNDERGROUND MAP - NORTH LONDON LINE

The letter Jonathan Wilson had received from London Regional Passengers Committee was noted.

David Reynolds said that London Underground had just appointed Denis Tunnicliffe, and, as he had an aviation background, perhaps he should be approached. It was AGREED that the Honorary Secretary would write to him.

[ACTION - SWI]

10. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED FROM HEATHER HOWARD

A further letter from Heather Howard had been tabled, as was a letter from Shelagh Vouillemin.

There seemed to be very little the Committee could do. Roy Featherstone wondered whether Heather Howard was anticipating a problem. Norman Adams felt that she was entirely justified in bringing her fears and concerns before Committee.

The Chairman asked how many routes passed over Blackheath. He was advised by Jonathan Wilson that there were 7 flights per day, covering both airlines. This would increase in September to 11 per day. These were the Paris outbound flights. He estimated that if there is any disturbance it would equate to roughly 11 minutes per day. Norman Adams felt that there were many more aircraft than that and he was advised that other turbo-prop traffic going to Heathrow and from Gatwick also passed over Blackheath at times. Flights to LCY from Paris and to and from Brussels and Amsterdam do not as a rule fly over Blackheath.

Bruce Unsted asked that complaints about noise should be forwarded to him. The date and time of the incident should be supplied so that it can be properly investigated.

It was AGREED that the Honorary Secretary would refer the correspondence received to the LDDC.

[ACTION - SWI]

11. BAe 146 DEMONSTRATION

On the 24th July, there was a successful demonstration flight of the British Aerospace 146 aircraft at the Airport. An estimated 5,000 people attended the demonstration to see and hear the aircraft.

Norman Adams asked whether another demonstration was planned and, if so, whether a full passenger load could be carried, as this would give a true reflection of the noise factor.

Nicholas Hopkins said that although the present planning permission allowed for a further two demonstrations before 31st July, 1989, none were at present planned. He said that the noise effect of a slightly heavier aircraft are negligible. Jonathan Wilson said that the aircraft on 24th July had been flown at maximum weight, bearing in mind the constraint of the length of the runway. It's weight equated roughly to a 70% load factor which was felt to be representative of the likely operational weight of most aircraft using the Airport in ordinary passenger conditions.

Clive Arrow asked whether noise measurements were taken and whether they would be made freely available. Nicholas Hopkins said noise measurements were taken at several places. He could not say whether the findings would be made public. The LDDC and the London Boroughs of Greenwich, Tower Hamlets and Newham would be meeting tomorrow to discuss their individual findings.

Norman Adams asked whether a planning application for the use of 146 jets at London City Airport would now be submitted. Nicholas Hopkins said that it was fair to assume that an application would be made later this year.

12. AIRPORT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

At the commencement of the French holiday season on 11th July, Brymon and Air France had reduced their flights to and from Paris from fourteen to six per day. However, they would resume fourteen flights per day on 5th September.

The reduction in flights had led to a slight fall in the total number of passengers carried, but there had been an increase in aircraft load factors.

On the 19th July, Ms. Inga Uhrenbacher had been appointed as the Airport's new Marketing Manager.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Arthur Cattell requested further information on the redundancies announced last week by Brymon Airways. Tony Auld confirmed that on Friday 5th August, 6 people had been made redundant. He also confirmed that flights would be brought up to full strength in September. Arthur Cattell was of the opinion that staff had been made redundant on a previous occasion, but this was refuted by Tony Auld.

There was concern over the fuel tank storage area at the end of Camel Road and whether the tanks could be covered. Bruce Unsted said that the proper planning permission had been sought and obtained, and the Committee should accept that the planning consent had been correctly given. Jeff Hennessy confirmed that planning permission had been granted and that prior to this the Corporation had consulted widely on the application. This consultation had included the Metropolitan Police and the London Fire Brigade (even though the latter did not have locus under the Petroleum Regulations). Neither body objected to the scheme, although there was an acknowledgement that the elevated Silvertown by-pass might present an opportunity for criminal behaviour. The by-pass however, was due to be demolished at a later stage.

Bill Dunlop asked whether the fuel storage area was the responsibility of BP. Bruce Unsted advised him that BP were the Airport's tenants. Security provision had been made but for obvious reasons was reluctant to disclose them.

Cllr. Garfield wondered whether this area could be incorporated into the visit to be arranged with regard to the security fencing. This was AGREED.

The Honorary Secretary had circularised the Committee with the press release from the Department of Transport regarding the East London River Crossing. Norman Adams said that alternatives to the suspension bridge were being considered and he wondered whether the Committee ought to consider these and make its views known to the Department. The Honorary Secretary would write to the Department to register an interest in the issue.

[ACTION - SWI]

The Chairman asked that a further schedule of meetings be drawn up for the year 1988/89. Dates for the rest of 1988 had already been agreed. For the benefit of Members they are:-

Wednesday 21st September, 1988
Wednesday 2nd November, 1988
Wednesday 14th December, 1988
Wednesday 25th January, 1989
Wednesday 8th March, 1989
Wednesday 19th April (subject to Easter)
Wednesday 31st May, 1989
Wednesday 5th July, 1989

COMMITTEE YEAR END

Wednesday 16th August, 1989
Wednesday 27th September, 1989
Wednesday 8th November, 1989
Wednesday 13th December, 1989