

COUNCIL MEETING**25TH MARCH 2015****(A) QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY****1. From Annick Tuesley**

Why does the Council allow the Airport to state that it operates from 6.30 to 22.00, when those are the very hours that were overwhelmingly rejected (twice) prior to the Olympics, and what justification would there be for the Council to grant those hours now, and even more?

2. From David Hook

Will the proposed (by BHAL) limited number of Air Traffic Movements of 50,000 per year, be incorporated into the new Lease, and/or temporary adjustment to the existing Lease?

3. From Peter Birdsall

- (i) Regardless of the outcome of tonight's meeting, what steps are the Council planning to take which will increase the income from this relatively poorly performing investment property?
- (ii) Why did the Council refuse to give residents any detail about income to the Council when the Airport has been keen to mention large amounts in newspaper articles? How believable are those figures?
- (iii) How do you explain the most recent figure that the council stands to make £11million a year? Is that before or after all the infrastructure and service costs?

4. From Mike Overall

- (i) Irrespective of the result of tonight's debate, will the Council now ask the Airport to prepare a fully detailed Report on use of Alternative Flight Paths over open countryside on the East, accompanied by a Noise Action Plan that considers overflying of residential areas rather than airport contours?
- (ii) Since this seriously affects tens of thousands of Keston Village and Bromley residents, will the Council make publicly available detailed results of these studies and, if enforceable, impose sanctions for non-compliance by the Airport?

(5) From Michael Latham

- (i) Why are Members asked to consider this application given that the officer's report for Members states at Finance 1; *'It has not been possible to gauge how realistic these projections are at this stage as no detailed submissions were provided to support these proposals'* ?
- (ii) Why does the officer's report at 6.4 (d) not mention the environmental damage inflicted on the non air conditioned Princess Royal University Hospital by planes flying low overhead to land at Biggin Hill – as this can affect all Bromley residents – at particularly stressful times?
- (iii) Will Councillor Carr confirm the Chief Executive wrote to him on 22.9.04 and 3.3.05 about the; *'detrimental effect on the PRUH and its patient environment'* since when planes have become lower and larger - and that Councillor Arthur, non-Executive Hospital Trust Board Member, was party to those letters ?

(6) From Tony Trinick

- (i) Why did the Council not reveal that the supposed increase in jobs is not only linked to an increase in operating hours but to a raft of other major concessions to the Airport, including sacrificing Green Belt for hangars and building better access to the airport?
- (ii) Why did the Council not reveal (I quote from Appendix 1 of the NLP report) that there is an underlying request to de-link the "roles of the Airport from environmental factors including green belt, noise, access and amenity"?

(7) From Susan Radford, Petts Wood & District Residents' Association

Does the Council accept that the aircraft approach heights proposed in the trial announced in BHAL's press release will remain unchanged over Petts Wood and therefore the promised reduction in noise is likely to be minimal in our area?

(8) From Giuliana Voisey

- (i) Does the Council accept that the busiest and noisiest flight path is the one running below 2500 feet from Sidcup/Chislehurst to runway 21, as clearly demonstrated by the red corridor of NO votes on Map 2, Appendix 8, which gives a very good indication of where the main problem is?
- (ii) Does the Council realise that the estimated increase in revenue of £626,000 in 15 years' time equates to just £90 per household under this flight path alone, in 15 years' time, and the proposed Community Fund equates to £20 (£110 in total) based on a very conservative estimate of 7000 affected households?
- (iii) How do 2300 jobs in 15 years' time in a borough that only has 1.4% unemployment (which is as low as it can realistically get), mainly created by attracting non-Bromley employees, compare with the sacrifices you are asking more than 100,000 of your residents to make from now?

9. From Hugh Bunce

- (i) Why has no mention been made of the PRU hospital, one of the largest in South England, 1.5 miles from the end of the runway, with aircraft only 700 feet directly above creating a serious safety risk, and what can be done to restrict jet movements over this sensitive site?
- (ii) The flight path crosses from Locksbottom, to Bexley, covering 200,000 residents, two major hospitals, and 8 schools, (one of the most densely populated areas of the UK). Is the safety, quality of life, and environment of these people more important than developing an airport with severe infrastructure limitations?
- (iii) There are over 100,000 voters in four constituencies who are subjected to the effects of the flight path to Biggin Hill Airport. If you make a decision against their wishes are you happy to lose these constituencies on May 7th?

10. From Barrie Mayer

- (i) Isn't a decision on this Application seriously premature as most all the mitigating factors offered by BHAL or suggested by Cole Jarman are untested, best-efforts or insignificant?
- (ii) Does the Council accept that the Noise Action Plan presented by the Airport is only limited to "assessing progress every 5 years towards noise reduction within the Airport contours" (page 10) and, if so, how is this going to help residents?

11. From Jason Polis

- (i) What would be the contractual and other legal provisions to revert the lease back to its current terms should the promises made, including those about noise reduction, fail to materialise or meet expectations?
- (ii) What budgetary, legal and contractual provisions would be made to defend council and councillors from legal actions in relation to the consequences of any decision made in relation to this matter?
- (iii) What are all the expected consequences for residents and council of earlier and later flights on every day and night of the week?

12. From Will Curtis

In the light of the overwhelming support for the proposals made for the future use of Biggin Hill Airport, does the Leader agree that, provided that environmental concerns can be satisfactorily addressed, the proposals made by the Airport will secure the future of the airport in the quietest and lowest density sector of commercial aviation whilst at the same time providing both social and economic benefits and safeguarding the heritage of Biggin Hill airport?

13. From Robert Walters

Can the Leader say what alternatives there may be to business and general aviation if the airport continues to lose market share due to its unfavourable operating hours and what other sectors of commercial aviation exist that could fill any revenue shortfall resulting from further loss of market share?

14. From Barry Sergeant

With 31,500 residents supporting Biggin Hill's proposals, does the Council feel that it has received a clear instruction from residents to support BHAL's proposals?

15. From John Willis

Does the Leader believe that the planned Aviation Technical College will fit well with the recently announced and very commendable boost in the government apprenticeship scheme such that it will create jobs for Bromley residents and align with current Conservative economic policies?