

REDHILL AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Revised draft minutes of the virtual meeting of the Redhill Aerodrome Consultative Committee held on the 29th September 2021 at 10.00am via Zoom.

PRESENT:

Terry Pollard (Chairman)
Catherine Baart (Surrey County Council)
Michael Blacker (Reigate & Banstead Borough Council)
Jim Blackmore (Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council)
David Burke (Chief Executive, Redhill Aerodrome)
Paul Cole (National Police Air Service)
Wayne Clark (Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council)
Jonathon Essex (Reigate & Banstead Borough Council)
Pat Glenn (Bletchingley Parish Council)
Liam Hammond (Tandridge District Council)
Chris Hoskins (Nutfield Conservation Society)
Rigel Mowatt (Nutfield Parish Council)
Paul Murray (Keep Redhill Airfield Green)
Vince Sharp (Secretary)
Nick Stagg (Chairman, Redhill Aerodrome Ventures Limited)
Philip Wright (Aerodrome Manager)

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Richard Blaine (Aerospace Resources Ltd)

1. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed all attendees, especially Surrey County Councillor Catherine Baart who was attending her first RACC meeting.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 24TH MARCH 2021

The minutes were approved as a correct record.

Jim Blackmore requested an update to the following reference in those minutes:

"[Chris Hoskins] cited a recent incident where a large domestic animal had been frightened by an overhead helicopter, resulting in an injury to its owner. He was invited to supply details to either the Senior Air Traffic Controller or National Police Air Service (NPAS) Redhill Base Manager for this be investigated further (the NPAS Base Manager was happy to investigate complaints relating to police helicopter activity and speak to the relevant pilot, although without a date/time, it was not possible to confirm whether an incident was caused by a NPAS flight)."

Paul Cole confirmed that he hadn't received any details about the incident. He also explained that the National Police Air Service had its own flight monitoring system from which images of previous flights could be replayed. Phillip Wright advised that Redhill Aerodrome's flight monitoring system had did not have a replay facility.

3. FLIGHT MONITORING

The Aerodrome manager's flight monitoring reports for March to August 2021 had been circulated prior to the meeting. These comprised movement statistics; complaints by residents about aircraft movements; and references to incidents / accidents. The reports attempted to be as transparent and informative as possible and now included annotated flight path diagrams.

Philip Wright explained that, since flying was allowed to resume following the lifting of Covid restrictions, the number of fixed wing flights had increased significantly. In common with other general aviation aerodromes, this had been accompanied by a corresponding increase in noise complaints which could, in part, reflect the greater numbers of people working from home underneath flightpaths. He acknowledged that some pilots deviated from the correct flightpath by following the line of the M23 too closely but explained that the aerodrome did what it could to educate pilots. While deviations from the prescribed circuits could never be eradicated, he confirmed that persistent offenders could be banned from the aerodrome; something which had only been done once to date (to an instructor).

4. UPDATE ON BUSINESS ACTIVITIES AT THE AERODROME

Nick Stagg was pleased to confirm that aviation activity had recovered since the lifting of Covid restrictions and that David Burke had been working hard to sustain tenancies for the industrial and office spaces. New lettings had been established, although some tenants were considering their future use of office accommodation. Both David Burke and Phillip Wright had made positive contributions to enable the aerodrome to maintain a break-even position, even though the business was not making a profit.

Jim Blackmore referred to his questions to Nick Stagg, which had been e-mailed prior to the meeting, regarding the constraints of the planning permission (granted by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council) for use of the taxiway i.e.:

- *when can the aerodrome use the taxiway as a runway?*
- *what about the requirement never to exceed a rolling average of 85 movements per day?*
- *how will the aerodrome report the movements on the taxiway to Reigate & Banstead BC and can the aerodrome send this information to Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council as it is mainly our residents who are affected?*

Nick Stagg advised that the taxiway would be used whenever the grass runways are not serviceable due to bad weather, either during periods of heavy rain or afterwards to allow them to dry out. He acknowledged that the aerodrome was liable to pay a penalty for exceeding the rolling average cap referred to above and explained that the charge was based on a full landing fee (as opposed to the discounted fees which the flying schools paid). Therefore, the penalty charges would have an adverse impact.

Jim Blackmore stated that the aerodrome could now bring in another flying school and receive all the income from that. Phillip Wright responded that there would be no benefit in doing that due to the movement cap.

Philip Wright stated that analysis of the flight movement figures for the winter 2020 period indicated that the rolling average cap would have been exceeded on four or five days. He emphasised that the aerodrome did not wish to exceed the cap and would be pro-active in limiting 'touch & go movements' and warning flying clubs about likely restrictions if bad weather was forecast. He understood residents' concerns about the potential consequences of the new planning permission but considered these to be unfounded.

Philip Wright also clarified the way in which flight movements were counted, i.e.:

- touch & go = 2 movements
- take off = 1 movement
- landing = 1 movement

He explained that the aerodrome's flight movement statistics were generated from the IT system for reporting to the Civil Aviation Authority and that there was no scope to manipulate data.

Philip Wright gave the following responses to questions from Paul Murray, Jim Blackmore and Chris Hoskins respectively

- there was no intention to change the status of the taxiway to a licensed runway – in any event, that would require the strip to be widened to 18m which was not physically possible
- take-offs from runway 08 departed to the east, away from Salfords
- the purpose of the gateway in the aerodrome perimeter near Crab Hill Lane was to provide access for aerodrome maintenance personnel – it could not be used for direct access to the airfield.

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(i) Local Plan

In response to a question from Paul Murray, Nick Stagg stated that Redhill Aerodrome Ventures Limited was still awaiting the outcome of the current Local Plan process and would respond to future consultation requests (from Tandridge District Council) when required.

(ii) Airfield markers / Salfords Primary School

In response to a question from Jim Blackmore, Philip Wright confirmed that the question of whether markers could be used on the western edge of the runway was not being ignored. However, he doubted whether this would help to address the issue of Salfords Primary School being overflowed. He would welcome feedback from the Parish Council about the merits of adjusting the relevant flightpath which, while reducing aircraft noise for the school, would mean that other residential areas could be overflowed instead. The possibility of widening the existing flightpath to help spread the noise was also discussed. In that respect, Nick Stagg cautioned that aircraft drifting off the wider margins could spread the problem much further beyond the current approach line.

(iii) Next meeting

Chris Hoskins asked if future meetings could revert to being 'in person'. Nick Stagg agreed that a return to face to face meetings would be preferable but warned that Covid was still an issue at the aerodrome with a member of staff recently having to self-isolate. He preferred to keep the situation under review before committing to hosting meetings at the business centre again.

The next meeting was scheduled for **Wednesday, 23rd February 2022 at 10.00am** with the venue / Zoom option to be advised.

The meeting closed at 10.45 a.m.

Extracts from the “unilateral planning obligation (under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990) by Redhill Aerodrome Limited to Reigate & Banstead Borough Council” dated 28.04.21 in connection with the planning permission for the retention of the widened hard-standing on Taxiway C/D (application reference 20/01430/F)

Definition of the ‘Permitted Cap’

Between the first calendar day of November and the last calendar day of March in any year, whilst the airfield is open for fixed wing aircraft traffic, no more than an average total of 85 daily fixed wing aircraft movements will be permitted to occur from Runway 07/25, assessed on a rolling seven-day average basis, and where each take-off and landing is considered to be a single movement (so touch and go's are counted as two movements). The methodology for calculating the seven-day average for any day will be the aggregate of that day's total movements together with the total movements occurring on the preceding six calendar days, divided by seven.

Schedule 1 paragraph 3 states that, in relation to the use of the Unlicensed Runway:

Not at any time to use any part of Taxiway C/D (including the Unlicensed Runway) for any Flight Movement (other than in cases of emergency or damaged aircraft) unless:

- i) the Grass Runways are Unserviceable; or
- ii) if no Grass Runway is available due to weather conditions, waterlogging, obstruction, regulatory requirement, emergency reasons or safety reasons.

Philip Wright has clarified that, *“whilst there is an obligation on RAL not to use Runway 07/25 at any time unless the grass runways are unserviceable, the movement cap only applies between 1 November and 31 March”*.