

EXECUTIVE

8 February 2023

QUESTIONS FOR ORAL REPLY

**1. From Mr Tony Trinick to the Portfolio Holder for Resources,
Commissioning and Contracts Management**

Does the Executive agree that the FPW findings in their 72-page Document on the BHAL NAP Review issued on the 4 January 2023, highlight at least 20 BHA NAP defaults which substantially increase noise and pollution for residents under the flightpaths from the pre-2016 levels?

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

Will the Executive now support a Revised NAP being put in place that brings BHA noise and pollution back to pre-2016 levels, and involve the residents in this task?

3. From Ms Giuliana Voisey to the Leader of the Council

As this administration is committed to upholding integrity, as I believe it is, how can its tenant be allowed to maintain the longer hours, having signed a legal document misrepresenting the deliverability of the new Approach to Runway 03, as clearly expressed by both the CAA and Cyrrus?

**4. From Ms Giuliana Voisey to the Portfolio Holder for Resources,
Commissioning and Contracts Management**

Gatwick has miles and miles of countryside at both ends of the runway, while there are only 2 miles between Biggin Hill and the residential areas at the North of the runway. Do you think it is acceptable that we now have such large aeroplanes with no real space for them to stay higher for landings and departures?

**5. From Mr David Clapham to the Portfolio Holder for Resources,
Commissioning and Contracts Management**

The Officers report (CSD2304) recommends to note suggestions to be incorporated within a REVISED NAP which could take 6 – 12 months to finalise. Residents will continue to suffer large jet movements low overhead. Why does the Council not suspend the additional operating hours until the REVISED NAP is in place?

**6. From Mr David Clapham to the Portfolio Holder for Resources,
Commissioning and Contracts Management**

On the 15th June 2016, the Executive debated Report DRR16/057 and resolved that;
“(1) BHAL has satisfactorily met all of the Council's conditions”.

Do you now accept there were insufficient sanctions built into the terms to account for non-achievement of the Council's conditions.