Monks Farm / Shoreham Aerodrome - York Report : FAO Mr J Appleton

John Gilder [redacted]
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

3 October 2018 at 13:51

[redacted]

Dear Mr Appleton,

Please find attached a further letter with our response to the York Report dated September 7th.

I hope that you will be able to refer to it in tonight's hearing and confirm that we would be pleased to meet with York to amend their report if they are required to do so.

Yours sincerely

John Gilder MRICS MRAeS
Vice Chairman

General Aviation Awareness Council

[redacted]

W: www.gaac.org.uk

181003 GAAC Shore'm SafeG.pdf .pdf
348K

GAAC

General Aviation Awareness Council

President: The Lord Rotherwick

Co-ordinating Office:

Bicester Airfield
Skimmingdish Lane
Bicester, Oxfordshire
OX26 5HA

Telephone: **01869 252493**
07702 116874

e-mail: **info@gaac.org.uk**
Website: **www.gaac.org.uk**

Mr J Appleton
Head of Planning and Development
Adur and Worthing Councils
Worthing Town Hall
Chapel Road
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1HA

3rd October 2018

Dear Mr Appleton

AWDM/0961/17

Hybrid planning application seeking (1) Full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 249 dwellings with temporary access via Grinstead Lane, a Country Park, relocation and extension of the Withy Patch Gypsy and Traveller site, permanent access via a new roundabout on the A27, landscaping, two additional football pitches and other associated infrastructure (including pumping facility at the River Adur); (2) Outline planning permission (with only landscaping reserved) for a non-food retail store (Use Class A1); and (3) Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved other than access) for the erection of a further 351 dwellings, community hub, primary school, and landscaping. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment.

I write in connection with the above application and its further consideration by Committee on 3rd October 2018. I am also aware of application AWDM/1093/17 and appreciate that both applications are, in principle, supported by the Councils, Albemarle Shoreham Airport in Administration (ASAL), the Brighton City Airport Consultative Committee and organisations committed to the economic future of the area.

My letter to you on the 8th August was in my capacity of Chairman of the APPG-GA Airfields Working Group and drew your Committee's attention to the lack of technical information relating to the current and future operations of the Airport and the failure to produce evidence that proper independent technical assessments had been undertaken.

We have since been presented with a copy of a report by York Aviation dated 7th September 2018 which purports to provide at least some of the evidence required. However, on closer examination by a leading authority on Airfield Safeguarding it seems that the Safeguarding plan provided is in error. He states specifically:

"I have modeled the safeguarding surfaces and analysed the areas of interest. (I have not included Nav Aids.) The attached (protected) pdf shows the limiting contours in metres AOD (see below).

The area to the West of 02/20 shows the restrictions imposed by the 1:5 transitional slope off the side of the runway strip. It is lower (more restrictive) than York's. Furthermore, York's contours go up to 80m. This is incorrect; the transitional stops at the Inner Horizontal at 46.52m AOD. In addition, the contours have to be modified by the surfaces off adjacent runways. These cannot be ignored. As you can see, similar problems occur to the NE.

So, while York has sort of proceeded along the right safeguarding road, it has not been accurate in its execution and has over-simplified the actual situation."

A subsequent email elaborates further but stresses the need for a full survey of the airfield as the maximum building heights need to be checked properly in terms of ground elevation.

A fully independent technical survey and appraisal is still required as this is not a matter that can be left to ASAL. The survey should take account of the specific physical characteristics of the Airport, the topography and the potential impact of the proposed development on the:

a. airspace around the Airport
b. integrity of the electronic aids to navigation
c. aeronautical ground lighting
d. risks arising from the potential attraction of additional wildlife

In addition, the evaluation should address the potential impacts on airport operation during construction of temporary lighting, construction equipment or, for example, dust generation, and consider any measures needed in connection with a new development to protect aircraft from the risk of collision with new obstacles.

Page 5 of the report refers to Helicopter training operations and an email from 'D Frisby' purports to give the operators point of view. However, D Frisby is not a helicopter operator on the airfield, he actually works for the developer and commissioned the report. His views are therefore not independent or those of the helicopter operators. Changes to the circuit have been considered but they are relatively minor as there is very little scope for alteration.

The future operation and viability of Shoreham Airport has to remain the councils priority given the increasing importance of General Aviation as evidenced by the Strategy and NPPF.

Until surveys and appraisals can demonstrate that the proposed development would not harm the Airport operations or that mitigation measures can be put in place to do this, the GAAC and APPG-GA cannot support these applications as the additional development planned on and around the Airport will jeopardise its long term future.

Yours sincerely

John Gilder
Vice Chairman

General Aviation Awareness Council

General Aviation Awareness Council

President: The Lord Rotherwick

