

COUNCIL MEETING

29TH JUNE 2015

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Mrs S Stribling to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Why are Bromley Council even considering Biggin Hill's proposals to extend the operating hours/flying times, when they know what a negative effect this will have on the PRU hospital's patients and staff, as it is only 1 ½ miles from the flightpath and planes fly over the hospital on descent?

Reply:

The Council as I said in my statement is legally obliged by the lease to consider proposals from its tenant and this proposal given what I said earlier might just make the situation better and not worse. It is not accepted that there is a particular problem for the PRUH.

Supplementary Question:

The PRUH is the only hospital in the UK to be situated just two miles from the airport touchdown with planes flying just 700 feet above the hospital. There is no air conditioning - I sampled that myself - and the windows have to be open for ventilation. You have proposed to agree to increase the hours of flight over the hospital from 6.30am until 11.30pm. In the minutes of the meeting on 25th March which I attended the acoustics consultant Cole Jarman stated that Biggin Hill received larger aircraft with increased noise. As the PRUH is directly under the flightpath how can you justify this?

Reply:

As I said, we have a duty to consider all such requests and we are doing so and we have to weigh the balance of positives and negatives. I might add that I have recently unfortunately spent three days and three nights in the PRUH and I did not notice a single aircraft.

2. From Mrs S Stribling to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

As there are no guarantees whatsoever to reduce noise levels and we are only being quoted what the aims are, how will Bromley Council tackle the problem of ventilation in the PRU hospital, as there is no air conditioning and the only ventilation is by opening the windows?

Reply:

Actually, mechanical ventilation can be provided to the wards with the windows closed although of course the windows can be opened for additional ventilation if desired.

The Council has not yet agreed to anything and the PRUH's lack of ventilation would be something that the NHS or the Trust can improve if they so desire – they built the hospital knowing there was an airport nearby.

The Department of Health 'Specialist Services Health Technical Memorandum 08-01: Acoustics' contains criteria for noise intrusion from external sources. With regard to wards there is no limit for maximum noise level during the day. At night, a level of 45 dB L_{Amax} is given when the windows are fully closed. The operating hours of Biggin Hill Airport are however restricted so that night flights do not occur. In a study in 2009, with the windows closed many of the daytime flights would have met even that night-time criteria.

Supplementary Question:

The Council propose to allow flights from 6.30am until 11pm Monday to Saturday. As the councillors have mentioned grants to many residents this tells me that the Council is fully aware that noise levels will increase and how can it possibly benefit patients. Windows must to be open for ventilation. It's not going to work, you've got to open those windows. I was there for five weeks and believe me you do. You must have been very lucky on your week.

Reply:

Hospitals usually wake up at about 6am I can tell you to my cost. Flights do not begin until 6.30am and therefore we are not waking folk up as the nurses have already done that job.

3. From Mrs S Stribling to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Did Bromley Council include the PRU hospital in their survey and make the hospital aware of the proposals to extend BHAL's operating/flying hours and to fly larger and more planes over the hospital, considering how the hospital opposed the extension three years ago?

Reply:

The PRUH could have responded with the 40,000 who did had the hospital wished to. It is not true to suggest that the PRUH objected to anything 3 years ago. The Council's consultation was open to anyone and any organisation to respond to but was specifically targeted at residents rather than organisations. BHAL have not proposed to operate larger planes than are currently permitted, and neither are they proposing any increase to the total number of movements.

Supplementary Question:

As the increased hours will have serious implications for the hospital, one would have expected Bromley Council to include the PRUH and Kings as formal consultees and to have held meetings with them in advance of the agreement on 25th March. However, I have a letter here dated 4th June from Kings College Hospital and the PRUH stating that the Council did not include them as a formal consultee and in fact Kings are having to approach the Council to request a formal meeting this late in the day. I personally find this extremely alarming. Could you please explain?

Reply:

Telephones work both ways – I don't understand why the hospital did not get in touch – they must have known all about this and I am very happy to talk to them even now.

4. From Mr Peter Zieminski to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Helicopters are particularly noisy and fly lower than the permitted 1,000' above residential areas. Can LBB insist that arriving/departing helicopters descend from and lift to not less than 1,000' within the airport boundary and can they also route from and to Biggin Hill even higher?

Reply:

Movements, including those of helicopters are covered in operating criteria and cannot be changed without the agreement of both the landlord, the Council and the tenant, the Airport.

5. From Mr Peter Zieminski to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

As helicopters are generally very noisy, are they permitted to use the airport given the restrictions in the lease under the Third Schedule, Operating Criteria, part (f) and has the Council's Chief Environmental Health Officer undertaken measured noise data tests in accordance therewith since the proliferation of helicopter movements?

Reply:

Yes, they are permitted.

6. From Mr Peter Zieminski to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Are there any proposals to amend the current flight tracks to permit aircraft to fly directly over Keston Village?

Reply:

The Council supports the Airport's proposals to route flightpaths away from residential property and understands but acknowledges that CAA approval is required.

Supplementary Question:

How specifically will local residents be involved and consulted over any proposals to amend the flight-tracks for the future of Biggin Hill Airport's use?

Reply:

That will be extremely difficult to arrange as we have these huge safety concerns and the CAA involved. Even with the Airport talking to the CAA and us as bystanders it is very difficult to get any kind of decision. We do not know quite where it will be yet. We do support the Airport's desire to route flightpaths as far as way from residents as is practical and we will do that. We do understand the concerns and it is our desire to make sure that residents are disturbed as little as possible. To have local residents

all around the borough involved in consultation is going to be a complete nightmare – I don't think we could ever do that.

7. From Guy Marks to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Is it possible to only permit any change in operating hours once BHAL can prove noise levels have been reduced and when they have implemented the proposed '03 runway approach' of aircraft at above 3000ft above sea level (bearing in mind Biggin Hill is approx. 690ft above sea level)? *Reason being why should BHAL bother once they have got the change in operating hours.*

Reply:

Legally, the Council cannot unreasonably withhold permission but is in discussions with the Airport to see what improvements to current circumstances can be made, with no agreement made.

8. From Guy Marks to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

What limits are there on the size of aircraft using Biggin Hill Airport? *Reason being we could have privately owned large jets using the airport.*

Reply:

There is no limit on the size or the weight of aircraft permitted to use the Airport. The Lease limits the aircraft by reference to the noise criteria and the runway length also indirectly limits the size.

9. From Guy Marks to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

How will breaches in noise level limits be dealt with? *Reason being there must be an appropriate deterrent that is enforceable in law otherwise it's a waste of time*

Reply:

The Airport is accountable for breaches in the lease and operating criteria. Any hypothetical and theoretical future agreement would need breaches to be dealt with as the Airport have publicly agreed.

10. From Michael Page to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Why did the Council totally disregard medical science and put the potential 2,500 jobs offered by B.H.A.L ahead of tens of thousands of residents who will now suffer with many serious medical conditions and who's children will suffer growth problems and learning difficulties and disrupted sleep.

Reply:

The Council has sought independent expert advice on matters relating to noise levels and relies upon government guidelines rather than the subjective perception of individuals whose personal experience will vary.

Supplementary Question:

By allowing over 5,000 aircraft movements in the first and last 30 minutes of the extended opening hours and no cap on the previous 30 minutes, this will deprive children of over 10,000 hours of sleep during their 13 years of schooling. How is this protecting the borough?

Reply:

Clearly it would be better if we had no airport at all, but we do have an airport and we just have to deal with the situation as it is and do our very best for residents. I'm not sure where that number came from, it does not sound a number I am familiar with. (16 a day over a year is 5,800.) That is rather more than I thought.

11. From Michael Page to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

In the Council's assessment document:

Why did the Council not disclose the Medical facts that saying yes to the extended flying hours would probably cause local residents major medical conditions which in turn would put a greater burden on the local N.H.S.

Reply:

I am not sure what medical fact is being referred to but it needs to be remembered that part of the Council's objectives is to improve the current situation.

12. From Michael Page to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Being responsible for the decision that almost certainly condemns this and future generations to underachieve academically and suffer from various medical conditions (which I wanted to explain earlier) earlier death than would be anticipated. What financial provisions have the council put in place to protect the borough against future claims?

Reply:

Bromley pupils have a long and proud record of academic achievement which will continue irrespective of any decision which has not been made and which may serve to reduce noise nuisance.

13. From Carole and David Murray to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

In the information we were given to consider when voting, there was no mention of the increase in the helicopter flights to transport people on from the airport. Could you please tell us how many more helicopter flights there will be as these fly very low and are extremely noisy.

Reply:

Helicopter flights are included in the overall volume of permitted movements within the current arrangements, with no decisions taken regarding the future. Nevertheless, the subject of helicopters is of interest to local people and was raised at the Council's Executive meeting and remains part of discussions.

14. From Carole and David Murray to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

From our memory, in the information given there was no mention about the size of aircraft that would be able to use the airport. We have recently noticed an increase in the size and number of aircraft using the airport. Could you please let us have the figures for April and May 2014 and 2015 to enable us to compare.

Reply:

The control within the Lease is related to the noise produced by an individual aircraft and not by its weight or size.

The total number of corporate aircraft in April and May this year was 1646, an increase of 97 or 6.3% compared to last year. The average tonnage of individual aircraft in April and May this year was 14.5 tonnes, an increase of 0.6 tonnes or 4.5%. As the economy improves, I am advised that the Airport is seeing modest increases in volume, well within the lease, having being generally 'flat' over the past 5 years.

As aircraft technology improves, particularly in controlling the noise output, it follows that the size and weight of permitted aircraft will increase while still satisfying the noise criteria.

15. From Carole and David Murray to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Has the noise level from aircraft been measured in recent months as we feel this has increased?

Reply:

No, but I refer to my previous answer.

16. From Adrian Stoneham to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

The Council's Assessment of BHAL's Proposals by Cole Jarman, Acoustic Consultants, set out a number of unspecified matters, for example:

BHAL to quantify and agree with the Council's existing noise levels;
BHAL to establish and agree with the Council the limits on noise; and
noise limits to be agreed;

Why isn't a proper and full investigation, and an assessment of impact/mitigation in place so that an informed decision on this matter can then be taken?

Reply:

The Council did assess the proposal it received and the Council's expert has given advice. Clearly both the Council and the Airport would need to agree limits before an

agreement could be reached – both parties have to agree. The Council's advice is clear about using quantifiable, measurable and objective data.

Supplementary Question:

I would like to know why this cannot be done before any further decision is made so that there is absolute certainty and transparency. Without this sort of process, including an Environmental Impact Assessment we have no idea of the impact and damage on residents and your report dismisses this far too lightly.

Reply:

Clearly we have to rely on the advice given by Cole Jarman and I will have a chat with them after this meeting to see if there is anything more they can do to inform us.

17. From Adrian Stoneham to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

There can be no question that allowing flights at times which are currently quiet will have a detrimental effect on residents. These would be at those times of the day most sensitive to noise, early in the morning and late at night all through the day. How can this be said to positively improve health and quality of life, as is required by policy?

Reply:

There has to be a balance. Whilst no agreement has been reached, if overall noise levels were decreased and permitted overall flight movements were reduced, this could be seen as an improvement on the current situation.

Supplementary Question:

I would like to counter that. The special sensitivity to noise in the early and late hours do not appear to have been considered and I would like to know why not?

Reply:

They have been considered very earnestly if only at the prompting of everybody that lives in the flightpath. We have taken it very seriously and it will be fully measured in the balance when we take our decision.

18. From Adrian Stoneham to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Why doesn't the operator put in place the changes to reduce noise now so that the community can judge their effectiveness and then make a decision on increasing flying times? If the operator is confident that they would be a success this should not be a problem.

Reply:

I cannot speak for the Airport and can only repeat that the Council assessed the entire proposal it was presented with. It is a matter of public record that the Airport have started some of the processes including flightpaths with the CAA required to effect changes from the current operations.

Supplementary Question:

So we wind the clock forward, we get to September and, let's assume the decision is to allow this go ahead, we then have local residents effectively paying in advance for this problem while BHAL have the license or the extension required. If the operators believe they can reduce the noise as stated, why is this not being done now, why are we being forced to wait for a decision in September when they can operate as they wish?

Reply:

It is probably the same question. I cannot speak for the airport. It would be very nice if they did do this, but some of these things take a long time. We will encourage them to do so.

19. From Anthony Young to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Aircraft including helicopters which are under the jurisdiction of the airport fly over our houses and gardens completely ignoring the flight paths. I have rung the CAA and asked them why I can read the tag numbers from about 100 feet above my garden. They do not adhere to the flightpaths. I would like to put in for planning for a barrage balloon. How can we guarantee that when or if you have agreed that they can have their extension for the extension of their times, I understand aircraft based there now can have another hour either side and does that mean another hour either side of extended hours?

Reply:

Part of the proposals would actually give us better monitoring and accountability and that would be good for everybody. Breaches of the lease need to be brought to the Airport's attention so they can investigate and take action if a rogue aircraft is doing something they need to know about it so that they can do something. The Council will certainly take action as landlord if needed and if the complaint is proved.

In the past, many helicopter complaints have related to the Police, Air Ambulance and to helicopters which did not originate from Biggin Hill. If implemented, the integrated noise and track keeping system will for the first time enable the Council to identify individual helicopters and to confirm whether or not they are associated with Biggin Hill.

Supplementary Question:

I have constantly phoned Biggin Hill Airport about planes flying down my garden, and I do not mean at high level. I get an arrogant reply and then I get put on to an answerphone. Leave a message – yes, someone comes back, we had to let that aeroplane fly in over your garden because it got in before a jet, these are the sort of answers we are getting. If they are in breach of their lease - I own several properties, if my tenants are in breach of their lease we can do something about it. The London Borough of Bromley does not seem to be have control. I know they cannot police it 24 hours a day, we understand that, but the airport seem to be taking liberties beyond what should be taken in life.

Reply:

When we get the new noise monitoring devices in we will be able to monitor what is going on we will be able to monitor much better than we can now and we will not hesitate to take action if that is what is required.

20. From Hugh Bunce to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Air pollution associated with aviation includes particulates, unburnt hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides. Who is responsible for carrying out air quality tests, and where can I see results for monitoring around Biggin Hill and along the flight path from Chislehurst to Biggin Hill?

Reply:

Following extensive modelling for a range of pollutants, including those highlighted, in March 2007 the Council declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) covering the North and North West of the borough for the pollutant nitrogen dioxide.

Subsequently an Air Quality Action Plan has been implemented and regular air quality monitoring is undertaken within the AQMA. The results are assessed and published regularly and show no further modelling or monitoring is required at present. Currently no monitoring is undertaken outside of the AQMA.

Supplementary Question:

Does that include the flightpath between Chislehurst and Biggin Hill and would it not be sensible to undertake some risk assessment for those thousands of residents who could be subjected to such pollution along the flightpath.

Reply:

I do not know the answer but I will find out and let you know.

21. From Hugh Bunce to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Does Bromley Council accept that the application to change operating hours will benefit few residents across the borough, but reduce the amenities, environment and quality of life for 130,000 residents living along the flight path from Chislehurst to Biggin Hill?

Reply:

No. The application could, if we get what we want, actually benefit all residents and there is a balance of positives and negatives which need all the consideration we can give it. The Council is also legally required to be a reasonable landlord to its tenant.

Supplementary Question:

If it can be demonstrated that the overwhelming majority of the 130,000 residents along the flightpath are strongly opposed to extended operating hours, would Bromley Council please reconsider its decision?

Reply:

We have not made a decision. The feelings of the residents who have made their feelings known will be fully taken into account and we will make our decision accordingly. Whatever our residents say, we still have to be a reasonable landlord.

22. From Hugh Bunce to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Why has Bromley Council not considered the impact of sleep disturbance for residents living along the flight path, as a direct result of the application to change operating hours, with particular reference to the impact upon children?

Reply:

The Council has sought expert and independent advice about noise disturbance and therefore the potential impact on sleep. Ultimately, government guidelines are the guiding principle rather than individual subjective views.

Supplementary Question:

There are approximately 40,000 children living along the flightpath from Chislehurst to Biggin Hill. I quote from a House of Commons research report SM261 on sleep disturbance from aircraft noise - "The most notable effects in children are decreases in reading ability and memory." When you have consulted the staff of the eight schools along the flightpath can you tell me what they said about this point?

Reply:

I don't have that information to hand but I will discover it and I will let you know.

23. From Andrew Newlands to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

During the BHA consultation, did LBB consider weighting responses, from this borough-wide exercise, to fairly consider those most impacted by additional, earlier & later flights, over homes beneath the flight-paths, or near the airport, and why was such weighting not applied in fair consideration of its most directly affected residents?

Reply:

Responses were not weighted but recorded as part of the overall factors that needed to be considered in the Council's deliberations.

Supplementary Question:

The consultation being the primary voting influence on 25th March, how is it fair or reasonable that just 100 people from Crystal Palace in favour of the proposals, that is less than 1% of that ward, resulted in two votes for the proposal in this chamber, whilst an opposing 2,500 Farnborough and Crofton residents translated to just one vote against. Will the Council conduct a further unbiased survey in keeping with its duty to protect the .13 million residents under the flightpath?

Reply:

I do not believe that having a re-run of the referendum on whatever basis will give us any more information than we already have. We are fully aware of the feelings of those that live under the flightpath.

24. From Annick Tuesley to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Given there are at least 10 Schools within the Borough and directly under or very close to the flightpath, what steps have been taken to involve head teachers in the

consultation process, with particular regard to the loss of sleep for pupils and its effect on their school performance?

Reply:

I am not aware of any complaints ever being made by or on behalf of a school alleging that aircraft noise is interfering with lessons. The proposed increase in operating hours will have no impact during school hours. Furthermore, I am not aware that any school is currently aware of any problem with sleep for pupils, with pupils presumably sleeping in the current operating hours. Neither are headteachers expert in this field and nor is Biggin Hill Airport the only airfield operating within London. I get woken up by aircraft from Gatwick and Heathrow but not by Biggin Hill.

Supplementary Question:

You call yourselves a reasonable landlord. Will the Council undertake measures to take and record complaints from residents for breaches of the lease because they are not doing so now. When people phone up and complain about aircraft coming in when they are not supposed to, as the gentleman previous to me said, they just get pushed over to Biggin Hill Airport and nobody at Bromley Council as landlord takes responsibility.

Reply:

We will see how we can improve on the current situation.

The time for taking oral questions having expired, the following questioners would receive written responses to their questions in accordance with the Constitution.

25. From Mrs Penelope Denby to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Were the clinical and non-clinical management team at Princess Royal University Hospital, only 500-600 metres from the public safety zone according to UDP, invited to participate in the consultation about Biggin Hill Airport? If not why not?

Reply:

I refer to previous answers given, with all and any individuals able to respond.

26. From Mrs Penelope Denby to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

If the council agrees to Biggin Hill Airport's request for an extension of hours 6 more flights per day by 2030 are forecast to be flown? Has the council considered the effect of increased noise on patients recovering and staff working in the PRUH?

Reply:

The Council is considering all potential impacts and no decision has been made.

27. From Mrs Andrea Stevens to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

How many noise monitoring stations are currently in use to measure noise emanating from aircraft landing and taking off at BHA, where are they located and to which LBB Committee do the results from these stations get reported?

Reply:

None. The Biggin Hill Consultative Committee, which has Bromley Council representation does consider noise monitoring and complaints and alleged breaches of the lease are taken very seriously by the Council.

28. From Mrs Andrea Stevens, to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Prior to BHAL's purchase of Milking Lane Farm, at a cost of £1.6m, nine months ago on 14th September 2014, were the Council made aware of the Tenants' intention to purchase this extensive piece of agricultural land immediately adjacent to the north-western end of the main runway 21?

Reply:

No.

29. From Robert Pattullo, to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

In Section 5.10 of the BHAL lease, BHAL are required to pay all costs for every application made by the Tenant. What were the Landlords costs of the Olympic Games application and have these been paid by the Tenant to the Landlord?

Reply:

At the time it was considered debateable whether the Olympic proposal was caught by this provision. However, I will ask officers to revisit this.

30. From Giuliana Voisey to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

Are members of the council aware that Aviation Minister Robert Goodwill, in co-ordination with the Civil Aviation Authority, is considering requests from Heathrow, Gatwick, City and Farnborough airports to review the same track-monitoring systems that BHA would like to introduce in Bromley because of the disturbance and anxiety they have caused to residents?

Reply:

No, not at present, despite contacting both the Department of Transport and the CAA. The CAA have said that they "certainly do not oppose web track tools. Anything that provides transparency for the public regarding aircraft movements has to be a good thing."

31. From Giuliana Voisey to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

Are Councillors aware that the noise protection we have in the Lease is stronger than the noise monitoring schemes the Airport are now trying to apply? Why have the Council not applied the clauses which are already in the Lease?

Reply:

Noise protection and noise monitoring are fundamentally different and the Council is seeking to strengthen both, with no decisions taken.

32. From Giuliana Voisey to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

Why do you believe that a machine telling you that average noise over a 16-hour period is within limits can be considered a satisfactory compromise for a 27% increase in hours at the most unsocial times of the morning and night? How can this be a "better deal"?

Reply:

Machines are objective but are only tools to aid us. Any decision is made up of several components this is no different and although no decision is made, it deserves and will always get, our careful consideration.

33. From Anthony Barnes, to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

During the consultation, did LBB consider weighting the results of the Borough wide survey to fairly reflect those impacted most by any additional early and late flights, over homes under the flight paths and/or close to the airport? If not why not?

Reply:

No. Responses were not weighted but analysis did note that whilst most respondents supported the Airport's proposal, many under the flightpath did not. The consultation was one consideration among many that the Council took regard of.

34. From Anthony Barnes to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

During the BHAL similar application in 2000 in addition to a thorough and statistically much more sensible way, the Council held four public meetings, (Crofton Halls, Civic Centre, Charles Darwin School, Biggin Hill 2) attended by nearly 2000 people. Why did LBB not repeat this exercise for this application?

Reply:

By asking for all residents views, the Council actually consulted more residents than in 2000.

35. From Anthony Barnes to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Recently there has been more frequent use by jets of the right hand visual circuit to land on runway 21. They often pass overhead Keston village descending on a more or less splayed base leg. Can LBB insist that all jets landing on 21 are via a straight in approach?

Reply:

No. Any proposal by the Airport to change landing or take-off procedures must be approved by the Civil Aviation Authority, and LBB cannot impose any such change

36. From Vivien Haskey to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

For the good of the environment & the Borough, I recycle all my plastics, paper & wasted food, clear up rubbish in the street outside my house, trim side shoots off trees and I am a snow friend organising snow clearance in Keston. What is the point of doing all this if you are going to ruin the environment by extending the airport with extra noise & pollution, building on green belt, putting in extra car parks in Shire Lane, extending the infrastructure etc.

Reply:

Thank you for what you are doing. The Airport is not being extended but there is a proposal to extend operating hours by a relatively modest amount which has a number of benefits, part of which could be additional protection for residents. I repeat, no agreement has yet been reached.

37. From David Evans, Downe Residents Association to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Ref: Biggin Hill Consultation Analysis - Appendix 8 Map 2.

In terms we can all understand, logic says one dot must represent one reply, is this the case?

Reply:

Yes. As Appendix 8b stated, which was distributed on the evening of 25th March, - To portray the information graphically and by household response, the 'red and blue dot map' has been produced, which involved a complex process of 'geo coding', to effectively place the responses onto the 'red and blue dot map'. This process did not successfully pick up each and every address but the map does show the overall trend for responses across the borough in a way that simple reporting by ward does not and this is why the map was published as it is.

38. From David Evans, Downe Residents Association to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Why does a single red dot appear at Luxted, south of Downe Village, when I and at least five other households in that area responded?

Reply:

I refer to my previous answer.

39. From David Evans, Downe Residents Association to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Why did certain households particularly under the flightpath, for example Shire Lane, not receive an invitation to participate?

Reply:

I refer to my previous answers. All households were invited to participate.

Supplementary – We did receive responses from residents in Shire Lane, five in total, all ‘no’. Also, no distribution is ‘perfect’ and where ‘misses’ were brought to our attention, they were rectified at the time.

40. From David Clapham to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

The extensive URS Report – Biggin Hill Study – Final Report along with the London Plan designation of Biggin Hill Airport as a Strategic Outer London Development Centre (SOLDC) guide planning direction. Were Councillors briefed on the implications and context of these fundamental plans prior to the discussion on 25th March 2015?

Reply:

Yes. The Local Development Framework Advisory Panel, of which I am the Chairman, received updates on:

- 22nd April 2014
- 18th June 2014
- 5th August 2014
- 15th January 2015
- 24th February 2015.

The report and findings were also considered at the Executive on:

- 12th June 2013
- 26th November 2014

and R&R PDS on:

- 23rd June 2014
- 18th November 2014

41. From David Clapham to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

The Employment section page 52 of the URS Report – Planning for Growth in Bromley – Biggin Hill Study – Final Report says that the predicted growth in jobs of 930 by 2017 ‘would appear ambitious’. What confidence do you have in these predictions?

Reply:

Estimates and predictions are valid but they remain just that.

42. From David Clapham to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

In view of the fact that Councillors were not all aware of background growth plans for Biggin Hill Airport please confirm that once discussions with Biggin Hill are concluded, that Councillors will be allowed to express their views and vote on the proposal before the Executive makes the final decision.

Reply:

The Council's own report considered by Councillors noted the growth plans and specifically said that "The Airport has been identified as a Strategic Growth Area by the GLA and BHAL plans indicate that the Airport could create up to 2,300 jobs over the next 20 years." It also referred to BHAL's economic growth plan produced in April 2014.