

# Joint Airport Scrutiny Working Group

## Minutes of meeting – 20 June 2011

**Present:** Councillors Godwin (Chair), Jordan, Wheeldon, Taylor and Witts  
 Officers – CBC – Pat Pratley (PP), Gill Morris (GM)  
 Officers – GCC – Meyrick Brentnall (MB)  
 Gloucestershire Airport Ltd (GAL) – Mark Ryan (MR)

**Apologies:** GCC – Peter Gillett (PG)

	Item	Action by
1.	<b>Apologies</b>	
1.1	Apologies were made as above. It was noted that Cllr Gill is no longer a Gloucester City Council member and a replacement will be needed for the working group.	PG
2.	<b>Minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2010</b>	
2.1	The minutes were agreed with all matters dealt with in the review report.	
3.	<b>Summary of the draft report (circulated 16 June 2011)</b>	
3.1	MB summarised the draft report. The report followed the same structure as the first review report and considered how the committee recommendations from the first review had been taken forward together with other progress made between 1 <sup>st</sup> March 2010 and 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2011. MB drew members' attention to the report's conclusion, which summarised the progress made, and the table of recommendations for members' approval.	
4.	<b>Member questions</b>	
4.1	Cllr Godwin asked about the energy efficiency measures that had been considered, including renewables, and the targets contained in the policy, which had been considered too ambitious in the previous review report. MB reported that GAL had investigated renewables and replacing the heating system, but both were currently unaffordable. He also said that, although the targets were useful, it was more important to get the baselines right first.	
4.2	Cllr Wheeldon queried the accuracy of the baselines, emphasising the importance of getting these right in order to understand whether GAL is on target. MB reported that GAL had been working on the baselines and were almost there, but he also emphasised that the process of establishing accurate baselines was inherently difficult.	
4.3	Cllr Witts asked whether the majority of noise complaints were still being received from a small group of regular complainants. MB replied that this was still the case. If the process was made clearer, however, and the public had access to more information, other potential complaints could be managed more effectively.	
4.4	Cllr Godwin asked whether any external comments had been received during the review period, particularly from Down Hatherley Parish Council, as a number had been submitted when the committee considered the first review report. MB reported that the Parish Council had had meetings with GAL and a reduction in noise had been noted as a result. He also stressed that noise was the most important issue for the community in terms of the green policy.	
5.	<b>GAL comments on the draft report</b>	
5.1	MR began by thanking MB and GM for their advice, particularly in relation to noise issues, which GAL would implement going forward. He then gave a	MR

	response to some of the member questions above.	
5.2	MR reported that GAL had investigated installing photovoltaic panels, but there were difficulties with location (GAL does not own all the hangars) and cost. Wind power was not an option. Ground source heat pumps, potentially the most practical renewable energy source, were very costly and the legal structure of GAL is such that it is an obstacle to obtaining funding. It was noted that GAL may be able to participate in the GCC PV Framework and MB agreed to send details.	MB
5.3	GAL is developing the baselines and is almost at the point where they can be published.	
5.4	MR acknowledged that noise was the biggest problem area. GAL had arranged a meeting between Down Hatherley Parish Council and a number of the operators; this had worked well and complaints were down. In terms of the website, he acknowledged GAL had become too technical in tackling the noise issue and there were some simple measures that could improve the process.	MR
5.5	In response to a query from Cllr Wheeldon he explained that the travel plan had been developed using a government framework and it had been pleasing to discover that employees were already doing a lot.	
5.6	Cllr Godwin asked whether there were particular issues GAL was struggling with. MR replied that renewable energy was one; however, noise was the biggest issue and complete satisfaction will never be achieved. Comparison of noise issues with other similar size airports is difficult as surrounding environs are different, but GAL had received a useful powerpoint presentation from Oxfordshire Airport.	
5.7	Cllr Wheeldon asked whether the CAA was promoting the retrofitting of silencers. MR reported that the CAA was not overly supportive. It currently costs in the region of £6k to have a silencer fitted, largely because of the certification process, and this is an obstacle to uptake.	
6.	<b>Runway Safety Project (RSP)</b>	
6.1	Cllr Jordan asked when it would be possible to look at other targets, which were dependent on the RSP. MR replied that some could be considered once the runway length was operational. However, it may take a year or two before the ecological targets can be considered as the vegetation will need time to establish.	MR/GM/MB
6.2	In response to a query from Cllr Godwin MR reported that all agreements were now in place, contracts had been awarded and the contractors were on site. The aim is to complete the physical work in twelve months. The technical certification process following this work is likely to take a further six months.	
6.3	Cllr Witts asked whether the cost of fuel had curtailed flights. MR confirmed that the number of leisure flights was down quite considerably, but business flights were considerably up, so the drop in the total number of flights was offset by the higher financial value. This is also the market GAL intends to focus on.	
6.4	PP asked the working group if it would be useful to arrange a progress meeting for the RSP. It was agreed a meeting would be arranged towards the end of the project and this would held at the Airport to enable members to view progress.	PP
7.	<b>Any other business</b>	
7.1	No other business was raised.	
8.	<b>Approval of review report</b>	
8.1	The working group approved the review report.	
8.2	Cllr Godwin thanked MB and GM for their work to produce the report.	All to note