

REDHILL AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

NOTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING HELD AT 10.00 A.M ON THE 6TH JUNE 2015 AT NUTFIELD VILLAGE HALL, MID STREET, SOUTH NUTFIELD

PRESENT:

Committee Members

Terry Pollard (Chairman), Ann Bartaby, Jim Blackmore, Don Butler, Leigh Curtis, David Miller, Paul Murray, Patricia Glenn and Debbie Vickers.

Members of the public*

Wayne Clark, David Dowden, Georgina Dowden, Trevor Jarvis, Wendy Jeavons, Carol Ledger Philip Lloyd, Sue Lloyd, Roger Long, Kent Sandiford and Isobel Taylor.

*Based on the signed attendance sheet.

1. INTRODUCTION BY THE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance. He gave apologies from members of the Committee, namely Chris Hoskins, David Cullen, Philip Wright and Helena Windsor.

The Chairman advised that the annual report had been circulated and any questions would be addressed under item 4 of the agenda.

He introduced Ann Bartaby, Chief Executive of Redhill Aerodrome Limited (RAL). In doing so, he reflected upon the damage caused by the fire on 12th April and acknowledged the distress this had caused.

2. ADDRESS BY ANN BARTABY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF REDHILL AERODROME LIMITED (RAL)

Ann confirmed that the Court of Appeal decision last October had signalled the end of RAL's efforts to obtain planning permission for a hard runway. She explained that RAL was now focused on optimising use of the Aerodrome's existing infrastructure to make the business more profitable. Without the impetus to diversify and generate additional income streams, she believed that the Aerodrome's financial position would remain fragile given the threats posed by competitors and the impact of adverse weather conditions.

RAL's future strategy would include measures to:

- support existing businesses and attract new ones (offering flexible terms to encourage tenants to invest, e.g. via longer term leases);
- sell more aviation fuel;
- maximise the use of non-aviation buildings;
- invest in refurbishing / developing the site (two properties had recently been sold to generate capital sums for this purpose);
- promote the Aerodrome more effectively; and
- host events on the site such as classic car shows and reinstating the annual garden party and air displays.

She highlighted the significance of the National Police Air Service's (NPAS) decision to remain at the Aerodrome. NPAS had withdrawn from other airfields but regarded Redhill as a strategically important site.

Ann gave an update on the impact of the fire on 13th April which had destroyed the Old Main Block building (approximately 12,000 square feet). This had affected the Chef on the Road cafeteria and 15 other small businesses. The Aerodrome had managed to re-house the businesses elsewhere on the site with minimal delay, utilising floor space vacated by a previous tenant at the end of 2014. RAL intended to replace the damaged building and hoped to submit a planning application in the near future. In the meantime, it was hoped that the much missed cafeteria could resume business in temporary accommodation.

She explained that RAL is planning to replace runway lighting which was now over thirty years old and in need of upgrading. She also confirmed that improvements would be made to the taxiway (response to question 1A in Item 4 refers).

Ann also advised that the Aerodrome would be hosting certain events over the Summer months including:-

- 14th June 2015 - Redhill Aviation Festival - Mini air display and Harley Davidson motorbike show
- 20th June 2015 - Air Aid Ball in support of the Surrey Air Ambulance
- 26th July 2015 – Caterham Rotary Club Half Marathon.

3. ADDRESS FROM NUTFIELD PARISH COUNCILLOR DAVID MILLER (REPRESENTING LOCAL RESIDENTS)

David introduced himself and explained that he had been recently elected to Nutfield Parish Council. He advised that he had lived in the village for eight years and welcomed the decision by the Planning Inspectorate to uphold refusal of the planning applications for a hard runway.

He acknowledged the achievements by the Parish Council but stressed the importance of ensuring that local concerns were taken into account by the District Council when setting future planning policy. He stressed that particular attention should be given to the preparation of the new Local Plan and associated processes which would identify sites with the potential for development (e.g. Strategic Housing Market and Green Belt Assessments). In this respect, he confirmed that the Parish Council would be involved in a Green Belt methodology workshop at the District Council Offices on the 8th June. David emphasised that the Parish Council would strongly oppose any inappropriate development in the area. He was, nevertheless, heartened to hear Ann Bartaby’s plans for developing the Aerodrome business.

4. QUESTIONS / VIEWS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

	Questions / views from the audience	Responses (from Ann Bartaby unless otherwise stated)
1.	Questions received from Colin Overall (who was not present at the meeting but had asked for them to be read out):	
1A	“In relation to improvements to part of the perimeter track ... [is RAL] ... intending to use this improved feature for take offs and landings?”	<p>Philip Wright had responded to the question which was read out by Ann Bartaby....</p> <p>“Taxiway C and D is a licensed Code A taxiway (minimum width 7.5m, there is no maximum width). The surface has undulations along a section such that the slope changes exceed those in CAP168 Licensing of Aerodromes. These undulations are noticeable when you drive along the taxiway. The licensed taxiway has to be maintained to CAP168 standards, regardless of the fact that it is used as an unlicensed runway when the grass runways are waterlogged.</p> <p>This section of taxiway contains the holding points C1 and D1 for Runway 36. When the grass is soft aircraft struggle to complete their turns while remaining on the paved surface. The aircraft are required to position into</p>

	Questions / views from the audience	Responses (from Ann Bartaby unless otherwise stated)
1B.	<p>“I have always understood that on taking off to the West that no turning was to be made by any aircraft until it had reached Benting Wood. Is this a CAA ruling or not, since many departures are turning long before this point in the flight path has been reached, resulting in overflying many residential properties along the A23 and A2044. “</p>	<p>wind for their power checks. Departing the paved surface on to soft grass risks damage to the aircraft. The Aerodrome Licensee is required to maintain a safe environment for aircraft to operate. Returning this section of taxiway to its previous width of 14m will enable the aircraft to complete their turns safely.</p> <p>The unlicensed Runway 07/25 has been used for more than 30 years.”</p> <p>Redhill Aerodrome Limited has no legal authority to prohibit aircraft from overflying specific areas within the ATZ. Pilots are requested to delay their turn until Benting Wood when departing from Runway 26 or Henhaw Farm when departing from Runway 08. This is to maximise the overflying of open areas within the ATZ in order to minimise the disturbance caused to local residents. Some pilots will turn before these points. This may be due to errors by student pilots, visiting pilots misidentifying the points or, a pilot deciding for whatever reason, they need to make a turn early. They are not breaking any aviation regulation in doing so.</p> <p>Specific tracks over the ground for aircraft operating under VFR cannot be enforced as the pilot may need to deviate to comply with the Standardised European Rules of the Air and/or the conditions of their licence.</p>
2.	<p>Councillor Jim Blackmore – How much of the perimeter track would be worked on?</p>	<p>A section of approximately 500m would be re-surfaced. The Council would be informed of the improvements as required by the terms of the permitted development rights.</p>
3	<p>Councillor Debbie Vickers – The residents of Henhaw Farm welcomed the meeting held with Philip Wright to discuss their flying complaints. They had also requested a meeting with the</p>	<p>This would be fed back to Philip Wright</p>

	Questions / views from the audience	Responses (from Ann Bartaby unless otherwise stated)
	head of the flying school.	
4	Peter Forbes – is it correct that parts of the taxi way do not conform to CAA guidelines?	Yes – response to 1A refers
5	Kings Mead, (South Nutfield) Resident – Is it possible for helicopters to fly higher over Kings Mead as they fly too low over the houses?	Clarification would be sought.
6	Paul Murray – In respect of the plans to replace the runway lighting, would this increase or decrease the number of lights on the runway?	The Chairman requested a response is brought back to the next Consultative Committee.
7.	The National Police Air Service (NPAS) has confirmed that it would be closing some of its airbases. Redhill has been identified as a base which would remain. Does this mean there will be additional helicopters flying from the Aerodrome?	At present, RAL is not aware of any plans to increase the number of police helicopters using the Aerodrome.
8.	Peter Forbes – Is it possible to see the specification for the replacement runway lighting before they are installed? Are they going to be brighter?	<p>The new runway lighting falls under permitted development rights so no planning application is required.</p> <p>The lights will probably be brighter to accord with current CAA guidelines. However, they will only be activated as aircraft approach for landing (i.e. to identify where the runway is). The will not be any upward beams of light.</p>
9.	Thanks were given to the Chairman, Ann Bartaby and the Secretary for their continued efforts.	

5. CLOSING REMARKS

The Chairman expressed thanks to the Consultative Committee for their support over the year and to Julie Porter who provided administrative services to the Committee on behalf of TDC.

He closed the meeting at 10.30a.m.