

**EXECUTIVE, RESOURCES & CONTRACTS**  
**POLICY DEVELOPMENT & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED FOR ORAL REPLY BY  
THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR  
RESOURCES, COMMISSIONING AND CONTRACTS MANAGEMENT**

**1. From Alisa Igoe to the Leader of the Council**

In early December the wait time for replies to applications to Bromley's £1.8m Household Support Fund increased from a few days to three weeks. Its policy document states the aim to assess and provide items within two weeks, yet failure to provide evidence will result in delay or possible rejection. To date, how many applications have been rejected due to lack of evidence, how many have been successful and what is the Fund's current balance?

**Reply:**

My latest advice is:

1. 37
2. 650
3. £1.1m

**Supplementary Question:**

The fund is available for members of the public to apply themselves. Why, since the 8<sup>th</sup> November, hasn't the fund been publicised to the public as much as other initiatives such as the business grants, tree planting and the tackling of loneliness?

**Reply:**

The question has been covered in previous Council meetings. The Council has to advertise this fund in the way that the Government desires rather, necessarily, than how the Council would perhaps do it itself. The fact that the fund has been publicised is best illustrated by the fact that there have been upwards of 1000 applications to the fund. It is well known, there is clearly great interest and people are continuing to bid for the grant.

## **2. From Tony Trinick to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management**

The Flight Path Watch report has been vindicated in your review, so why have not residents' issues been effectively addressed?

EG: Extended hours withdrawn; 50,000 cap retained; Lowering of 57dB to 51dB and 'indicative' replaced by 'maximum'; Noise policies now altered to reduce noise (item 3.41); BHAL to 'do maximum' not 'do minimum' (item 3.39.)

### **Reply:**

When the Council agreed the Noise Action Plan, part of the agreement included a Noise Action Plan Review. The whole point of this was to seek to ensure that noise generated by aircraft using the airport continue to be minimised in the best way possible. As a guiding principle, all the time that aircraft are using Biggin Hill Airport, then the Council would wish to see measures which minimise noise and disturbance to residents and this NAP Review gives an opportunity to assess what action the Airport has taken and consider the advice of the experts as well.

### **Supplementary Question:**

It is our belief that Biggin Hill Airport are in breach of their contract with the Council and has been for the past 5 years. So, why don't the recommendations in the report before the Committee remedy all these breaches with agreed completion dates rather than suggesting revising the Noise Action Plan (NAP) and reviewing it every five years after all the CAA states in its report that there is no requirement to revise or change the NAP at this stage?

### **Reply:**

The Chairman noted that the recommendations to be put forward by the Executive, Recourses and Contracts PDS Committee and the Executive had yet to be determined

The Portfolio Holder responded that as stated by the Chairman, the recommendations within the report were the Officer recommendations and as part of the meeting the Executive, Resources and Contracts PDS Committee may well recommend some changes to those recommendations and at the meeting of the Executive on 12 January 2022, Members of the Executive would decide what to go forward with but the Portfolio Holder would not assume that the recommendations within the report were the recommendations that would be taken forward.

**THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED FOR WRITTEN REPLY  
BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR  
RESOURCES, COMMISSIONING AND CONTRACTS MANAGEMENT**

**1. From David Thorpe to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning  
and Contract Management**

How will Bromley Council ensure that there are adequate controls to prevent Biggin Hill Airport allowing large (over 20 passengers) commercial passenger and cargo aircraft (i.e. EasyJet) to operate scheduled flights from the airport if the application is successful and fare paying passengers are allowed?

**Reply:**

The Lease contains important points of principle about how the Airport should be operated. From a lease perspective, it is not so much the type of aircraft that is important but the purpose of that aircraft, with fee paying passengers, to use a colloquial phrase, prohibited. This PDS Committee and the Executive are considering the Council's response to the Airport's Noise Action Plan Review and whilst I accept there may be a link, especially for questioner, it is the Noise Action Plan Review we must and are focussing on in this meeting.

**3. From David Thorpe to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning  
and Contract Management**

There are examples of large commercial aircraft operating from Biggin Hill including Boeing 737-700 and BAE 146. The risk was highlighted to the council in 2015 when the application to amend the lease was made and assurances were given that this would not happen. Why has the Council allowed this?

**Reply:**

The type of aircraft permitted to use the Airport did not change when the Lease was altered. It is therefore not a question of what the Council has or has not allowed.