

WYCOMBE AIR PARK JOINT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING HELD ON
22nd January 2013**

PRESENT

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Mr R Pushman | Chairman |
| Mr D Phillips | General Manager, Wycombe Air Park |
| Councillor R Emmett | WDC Member, Hambleden |
| Councillor J Richards, OBE | WDC Member, Greater Marlow |
| Councillor I McEnnis | WDC Member, Chiltern Rise |
| Councillor D White | Hambleden Parish Council |
| Councillor N Timberlake | West Wycombe Parish Council |
| Councillor M Detsiny | Lane End Parish Council |
| Councillor N Dunn | Great Marlow Parish Council |
| Mr H Luxton | Booker Common and Woods Protection Society |
| Mr R Wetenhall | Wycombe Air Park Action Group (WAPAG) |
| Mr N Phillips | Sands Residents' Association |
| Mr K Chanter | Frieth Village Society |
| Mr D Campbell | Booker Gliding Club |
| Mr J Smith | Divisional Environmental Health Officer, WDC |

(2 members of the public were in attendance)

1. The Chairman welcomed those present to this special meeting of the JCC, which would deal solely with the Noise Management & Action Plan already circulated by D Phillips. The purpose of the meeting was to consider the document and agree any amends prior to it going to wider consultation.
2. It was generally agreed that the first 18 pages or so, were a statement of fact. However, Councillor D White had some comments in relation to these pages and these were considered.
3. The introduction did not make reference to the WAPAG Specification Process. Following discussion it was agreed there was a linkage and there should be an entry to reflect this. It was also agreed this paragraph should go in Section 3 prior to paragraph 3.6.
4. The repetitive nature of the problem of aircraft noise was not mentioned and he felt strongly that the annoyance factor needed to be strengthened. It was agreed that in section 1.1, third paragraph, the first sentence be amended to read "Noise from aircraft continues to be a significant concern for our surrounding community **predominantly caused by repetitive circuit flying, which requires discussion**".

R Wetenhall also stated that the problems were exacerbated because of the low ambient background level of the areas overflown and this point too was accepted and felt should be reflected in the document.

5. There was discussion over the use of the words "has made" on the first line of page 12 and following discussion it was agreed to amend this to "**should make**".
6. It was considered the tables on pages 15, 16 and 17 should show a percentage figure for each type of aircraft. D Phillips advised that these tables were a direct copy from the noise mapping work undertaken by DEFRA. Following discussion this was accepted but a request was made to show the percentage of circuits versus other flying, as circuits were a key problem and it was felt the data should therefore be shown, if this was able to be produced. In addition, helicopter circuit data was also requested to be shown at an appropriate point in the document.
7. Councillor R Emmett requested that under 2.1 second paragraph, the reference to links with local universities be watered down.
8. Discussion took place around the proposed change of routes. H Luxton raised concern that the proposals would affect more people to a lesser degree rather than fewer people more. D Phillips advised that it was early days and much consideration would be required before he took this further as it was very costly to move to a variable runway routine. It was also conditional on getting the lease renewed with the council. He had agreed to fly the proposed route and the first trial would take place on Saturday 9th February. He wished to float this idea and if comments were negative it would not be pursued but if they were positive it would be investigated further.
9. In respect of the phasing out of the old Cessna 152 aircraft, should the lease be granted, he anticipated that within 12 months of that date he would have been able to replace his fleet, the proviso being that the aircraft were of course available from Cessna in that timeframe. He confirmed that there was an absolute commitment from the Air Park to change and there were no expansion plans. However, without a forward lease there was little point in investment. M Detsiny stated that whilst he considered this to be a very good document, he felt deliberations were premature at this stage until the lease had been determined. Councillor J Richards advised that the current lease ran until September 2014 and as part of the lease negotiations, the Air Park were required to inform the council what it planned to do and the meeting needed to be reminded that this exercise was also part of the process for renewing the lease.
10. R Wetenhall stated that the document lacked reference to helicopters. Paragraph 4.2 on page 12 made reference and D Phillips confirmed that the level of complaints from helicopters compared to fixed wing was far fewer, the exceptions being from Spring Coppice and the site of a converted barn in Lane End.
11. The issue of consultation was discussed. Consideration was given to putting in a structure in the form of a questionnaire which would also help with analysis and providing an executive summary. The use of Parish Council monthly magazines was considered and D Phillips confirmed his willingness to attend Parish Council or ad hoc meetings to discuss the document. Notwithstanding the foregoing, M Detsiny reiterated his concern that consultation was premature.
12. R Wetenhall proposed that consultation should initially commence with the local expert bodies who had knowledge about the process and once this feedback had been gathered and discussed and any amends made, the consultation could then be widened. The meeting's attention was drawn back to the fact that the lease renewal and the noise management and action plan were intertwined and the Parish Councils suggested if necessary they would be comfortable writing to the District Council to advice of the step consultation process. D Phillips considered that DEFRA/DFT would accept that the consultation should not be rushed.

13. R Wetenhall proposed therefore that the amends proposed by this meeting be incorporated by D Phillips into the document and this was subsequently published to interested parties through the JCC and the organisations they represented asking for informed responses by the end of March, which would then tie in with the date of the next JCC meeting.
14. D Phillips asked for full and frank feedback; he was not looking for just negative or positive feedback but for suggestions also. Comments under various broad headings would also be useful.
15. It was therefore agreed that:

D Phillips would make the amends to the text within 7 days;
Draft a covering letter for the Chairman to sign to accompany the document;
Send out the above by early February to the JCC;
All responses to be returned by no later than end March;
D Phillips to collate the responses in readiness for the next meeting of the JCC on 18th April.

The meeting closed at 7.55 pm.