

## LSACNF Meeting 23-Apr-24

**Relevant Statements presented by SS2 resident D. Smith for discussion and response.**

**Part 1 - Statements and Questions from the Lower end, Wells Avenue Residents (near to Avro Road). Residents will be identified to the LSACNF Chairman upon request.**

1) The LSACNF ToR dated August 2023 states under Conduct of Meetings that “LSACNF members are expected to recognize London Southend Airport’s (LSA) legal right to exist and operate under its existing S106 agreement”. The statement concerning operation prevents any resident that does not agree with articles of LSA operation in the S106 agreement, such as night flights, from participating in the LSACNF. The LSACNF is therefore exclusive, and not inclusive of the residents’ concerns and cannot present an unbiased view of airport operations. Residents require that the ToR statement regarding operation should be immediately removed to allow the integration and participation of members who do not fully agree with the articles of the S106 agreement.

**Question: When will the LSACNF provide for fully inclusive member access in its ToR and in its meetings ?**

The ToR was agreed by all CNF members. The S106 cannot be altered without agreement by all signatory parties (including LSA) and is not a responsibility of the CNF, which was confirmed by Cllr Buck in the meeting. CNF members do not need to agree with the terms of the S106 but must understand that this legal document cannot be changed by the CNF. The CNF allows meaningful discussion on how residents are impacted by the S106 and what the airport can do above and beyond this document to minimise noise.

2) Residents require that the text of the ToR should include a recognition of the serious consequences of all forms of pollution created by LSA and the methods to be applied by LSA to ensure that such pollution will be prevented.

**Question: When will the LSACNF address all forms of airport generated pollution in its ToR ?**

The ToR is agreed by all CNF members and will be reviewed again next year. It was previously agreed that pollution is discussed within the ACC forum and that the CNF should specifically discuss noise issues.

3) Residents wish to know what changes there are, if any, to the S106 Operational Controls, including the Noise Action Plan and the Quiet Ground Operations Policy, due to the ECC, RDC and SCC review. Also, what benefit is there to local residents, bearing in mind the previous disagreements regarding the wording in these documents, and the evidence in the wording in the S106, that there is no obligation to consult with residents on any of these issues.

**Question: When will the LSACNF provide to the residents details of any changes to the S106 Operational Controls resulting from the current ongoing review ?**

Please refer to minutes of the previous meeting and CNF 23-04-24 for updates on the Noise Action Plan and S106 Operational Controls. LSA has consulted with the ACC and CNF on both sets of documents.

4) Residents highlight the substantial noise emanating from adjacent Flying Clubs due to the constant revving of aircraft engines for long periods, also holding on Charlie Taxiway C1 for long periods, showing absolutely no consideration for the residents of Wells Avenue. In LSA’s expansion plan for 7 million passenger arrival and departure terminals, along with additional parking for 200-300 vehicles, both flying clubs are removed from the area. Why does it suit LSA to move flying clubs in this expansion plan, but not currently for the sake of the residents wellbeing and community relations ?

**Question: When will the LSACNF recognize, directly address and resolve Flying Club pollution issues ?**

Chair to add an agenda item for flying club activities and how they impact residents.

5) Residents consider that there is absolutely no reason for the Vulcan bomber to carry out any engine run ups on any part of Charlie Taxiway, in very close proximity to residents, including children and babies with delicate ears, in the lower part of Wells Avenue, which has previously occurred. This should only be carried out by towing the aircraft to more remote areas on the other side of the aerodrome, well away from homes and gardens. This activity is considered to be a deliberate act of annoyance and the cause of physical and mental harm to residents, and must be fully addressed in accordance with Health & Safety protections and requirements.

**Question: When will the LSACNF recognize, directly address and resolve Vulcan bomber issues ?**

The 'engine run' element is carried out on the main runway not Charlie taxiway. As the Vulcan is housed in the Hangar behind Wells Avenue, it may be necessary to power the aircraft to taxi. Vulcan engine/test runs are very infrequent. All engine runs are carried out in accordance with the airport's Engine Testing Plan. Any evidence of physical and/or mental harm from this activity and/or breaches in Health and Safety should be directed to LSA for investigation. The airport very rarely receives noise complaints about the Vulcan engine runs.

6) Residents continue to be disturbed by "helicopter pleasure rides", which use Charlie Taxiway frequently every 15-20 minutes throughout the day, showing no regard for residents health and welfare. This could easily be alleviated by using Alfa or Bravo taxiways instead.

**Question: When will the LSACNF recognize and directly address helicopter operation issues ?**

The airport does recognise that helicopter movements can disturb some residents. Where complaints are received the airport works with the helicopter company to reduce/avoid flying over specific areas, wherever possible. All helicopter flights are operated under the terms of the S106 and finish between 5-6pm and are scheduled for 2 days a month during the summer. These helicopters do not use Charlie taxiway and take off from the apron outside the Validation Point.

End of questions – Part 1.

## **Part 2 - Statements and Questions from DS to LSACNF / LSACL:**

1) LSACL is required to confirm the permanent end of night flights, to prevent future severe physical and mental suffering so caused to local residents, as campaigned for so publicly by the late and sadly missed Sir David Amess, MP for Southend West and continued by Anna Firth MP.

**Question: When will LSACL issue a public statement confirming the permanent end of night flights ?**

LSA will **not** issue a statement confirming the end of night flights. Night flights have significantly reduced recently however the provision of 120 night flights per quota month is a business asset and is essential when talking to new airline partners that may require the provision of delayed/diverted aircraft to arrive at the airport during the evening/night time. The airport also provides an executive Jet Centre which attracts business customers from all over the world. Both passenger and business jet operators are essential to the airport and support hundreds of local jobs.

2) LSACL is required to end night flights on a permanent basis, by officially closing the airport at night, so that all local residents (last est. over 69,000 in Southend West Ward alone) can experience their humanitarian right to a full and uninterrupted night's sleep.

**Question: When will LSACL issue a public statement confirming the permanent closure of the airport at night ?**

See answer above (part 2 Q1)

3) LSACL have not yet provided a public statement of their full understanding and admission of the serious impacts caused by the S106 Agreement and Amendment, which were exclusively legalized by 3 local councils in 2010 and 2012, without any direct prior consultation, understanding or agreement with all of the impacted local residents.

**Question: When will LSACL issue a public statement acknowledging the full physical and mental impact of the S106 Agreement and Amendment on the residents ?**

LSA continues to work with local residents through the CNF to help alleviate the impact of noise from permitted aircraft activities. As with all airports in the UK, LSA works to balance the positive regeneration, employment, and social benefits of a local airport with any negative impacts on its closest residents. LSA will **not** be issuing a statement in relation to the S106 but would address any proven cases of physical and mental impact through the correct procedures if presented.

4) LSACL admission of the fact that these misguided S106 Agreement and amendment **do not instruct** LSACL to facilitate night flights. It has always been LSACL's **own choice** whether or not night flights are allowed to operate.

**Question: When will LSACL fully acknowledge that it is purely their own decisions and actions that is has and plans to cause night flights to operate and severely impact the residents ?**

See answer above (Part 2 Q1)

5) LSACL are participants of the current review of the S106 Agreement and amendment, involving the signature Councils, but have not included the necessary direct involvement of the impacted residents and public in general in the ongoing review process, **before** any decisions are made privately and publicly in relation to airport noise and the environmental impact caused by airport operations. A specific and detailed response was promised by SOSCC on 16-Feb-24 but is still awaited.

**Question: When will LSACL confirm details of the ongoing S106 Operational Controls review to the residents, prior to any final decisions being made ?**

See answer above (Part 1 Q3)

6) LSACL have not yet provided public verification of the independence and impartiality of LSACNF, by supplying clear evidence of the reasons for stating this previously. This has been the situation since LSACL established this forum in 2021, and are continuing to facilitate, fund and manage its members directly. LSACNF effective representation of local residents, especially in SS2 area, has not been and remains not fit for purpose (see table below compiled from LSACNF MOMs).

**Question: When will LSACL provide clear evidence to prove their claim of the impartiality of the LSACNF ?**

LSA is one of just four airports in the UK to provide a community forum to discuss noise issues. There is no formal requirement to do so. The current Chair is working well to encourage new members. Interest in membership is challenging when the airport is quiet and there are very few noise complaints/issues, but we hope membership increases as the airport grows. Current CNF members seem content with how the forum is being run but suggestions on how to 'independently' fund the forum are welcomed. The forum is regularly attended by a member of the DfT who sits on other airport forums. LSA is considered to be offering a good and efficient forum in comparison to other airports. SS4 CNF member expressed gratitude for the Chair's impartial contribution to the forum and appreciation for his contribution to date.

7) LSACL have not yet provided confirmation of the direct inclusion of impacted local residents in the activities and decisions of LSACNF, as promised by the previous Chairman and the new Chairman. The impacted residents have once again received promises of action but these have not been realised to date. The new Chairman has invited the originator of this report to attend the next LSACNF meeting on 23-Apr-24, which has been accepted, but no advice has been given regarding the invitation of other impacted residents to this meeting. The representation of residents from postcode areas in the forum is stated to have been ended, but an alternative criteria for representation has not yet been published and implemented.

**Question: When will LSACL publish the alternative criteria for membership of the LSACNF, which will allow the inclusive participation of impacted residents ?**

The forum is open to all applications and the Chair is actively seeking new members to fairly represent the wider community around the airport and under the flight path, as well as those living adjacent to the airport. Details on how to apply for membership is published on the LSA website. As per the minutes of previous meetings, actions have been taken to improve representation for the Wells Avenue residents. Progress on membership is recorded in the meeting notes and remains an agenda item for future discussion.

8) *Statement and question REMOVED as it breached the CNF Code of Conduct.*

9) LSACL have not yet addressed the public functions and entertainment ongoing in the extremely hazardous and heat sensitive metal hangar adjacent to airport South Road, underneath the 60 year old Vulcan bomber aircraft, containing up to 9,250 imp. gallons of aviation fuel and extremely flammable fuel vapours. This was the proposed venue for the disastrous, and later postponed Southend City Festival in August 2022, the hazardous event staged in 2023 and the planned event in 2024. No prior notification of the hazards involved were published for attendees in 2023, and adjacent local residents were not fully consulted.

**Question: When will LSACL recognise that the public and residents are being put in harm's way when attending such activities within the airport boundary, without any public notification of the hazards involved being provided, and implement effective health and safety measures to fully protect all participants and residents from harm ?**

All events on the airfield, including the Vulcan hanger, are subject to CAA and safety regulations/controls. There is no evidence of harm to residents from these activities and not a single complaint was received about the previous Vulcan Beer festival, which was well attended by local residents.

### **Part 3 - Statements and Questions to LSACNF Chairman (relating to LSACNF MOM 16-Jan-24):**

1) **Item 4, Membership:** LSACNF continues to have an extremely blinkered view of the scope of the local residents impacted by airport associated noise. LSACL and LSACNF must recognize and acknowledge that equally impacted residents exist and live in neighboring roads and streets including Avro Road, Wilmot Road, Bristol Road, Vickers Road, Eastwoodbury Lane, Eastwoodbury Crescent, Rochford Road, Manners Way, Southend Road, Snakes Lane, Brendon Way, Bideford Close, and also the dense housing areas directly under the flightpath south of the A127 in Prince Avenue, Mendip Crescent and associated avenues, Dulverton Road, etc.

As the LSACNF is clearly aware, I have been very seriously impacted over several years by night flight noise, even at 0.75 miles south of LSA (as verified by the CAA), and there appears to be no recognition by LSACL/LSACNF of residents also impacted at greater distances, particularly towards and over Leigh-on-Sea. This item is also raised by Lower Wells Avenue residents

**Question: When will LSACL / LSACNF recognize the full extent and area impacted by airport noise and take action to prevent same ?**

By voluntarily providing a regular noise forum, the airport is acknowledging a need for residents to discuss noise issues. Other residential/community groups are encouraged to apply for membership on this forum. See answer above (Part 2 Q7).

**2) Item 5, Airport Update by Caroline Fitzgerald, S106 Operational Controls:** Quote “The S106 requires SCC and RDC to approve the updated plans however ECC has been invited to join the review process as a signatory of the S106”. The ECC is co-signatory to the S106 and is therefore required to be involved with any review process of either the Agreement or Amendment from the outset. This requirement was not fulfilled by LSACL from the start, but only actioned when highlighted by this resident on 13-Jan-24, just prior to the last LSACNF meeting. This item is also raised by Lower Wells Avenue residents.

**Question: Why did the LSA Customer Service and Commercial Director not include the ECC in the review process from the outset ?**

The Commercial director did not include ECC in this reference because ECC are not required to formally approve the Operational Plan reviews but as a signatory of the S106 ECC are welcomed to provide an input into the review process.

**3) Item 5, Airport Update by Caroline Fitzgerald, Community Impact:** Quote “LSA once again supported SECE Mind...”. LSA are supporting a very worthwhile charity, but also at the same time are actively implementing a completely opposite principle, by previously destroying and continuing to plan to destroy the mental and physical health of the residents by operating night flights, thereby forcing severe sleep deprivation on the unwilling local population.

**Question: When will LSA decide exactly what their humanitarian principles are, and publish them accordingly ?**

LSA, its charitable activities volunteers and participants have worked together to donate over £125,000 to local good causes including SECE Mind. Both the local community and LSA employees have benefited greatly from our partnership with SECE Mind.

**4) Item 6, Noise Data:** LSACNF are proudly promoting the operation of 2Excel Aviation Boeing 727 aircraft G-OSRA and G-OSRB aircraft out of LSA but are failing to record at the same time that these aircraft are 39 and 40 years old respectively, and therefore are extremely noisy, inefficient and highly polluting compared with other modern aircraft operating today.

**Question: Why have LSACL stated previously that they are promoting quieter and much more efficient aircraft operations from the airport, but have clearly not done so in this case.**

The 2Excel B727 is specially fitted with equipment to enable it to carry out its essential work, reducing environmental damage from Oil Spills. Currently this is the only type of aircraft fitted with this type of equipment.

**5) Item 7, Noise Action Plan:** A statement was made that “DRAFT NAP was submitted to DEFRA 31 August following consultation with all local authorities, ACC and CNF. Currently awaiting feedback response from DEFRA Deadline – to be published in Feb 2024. Likely to be extended”.

**Question: What is the current status of the DEFRA feedback and when will this be shared with the LSACNF and residents, especially regarding any night flight impact ?**

As per the CNF agenda – the forum will be updated on the progress of the NAP – see notes of meeting.

6) **AOB – LSJC and UCLF:** Quote “LSJC is looking to support the UCLF event 2 June 24. There is potential for LSJC to operate up to 20 night flights (depending on which UK clubs qualify) between 01:00 – 09:00. All flights will count towards the S106 night flight quota”.

This item, hidden within the AOB text, is not given the prominence which it deserves. To even consider such operations is extremely difficult to justify. It clearly demonstrates the total lack of concern and understanding shown both by the LSJC and the LSACL management for the severe impact on the health and welfare of the local residents that will undoubtedly result from such night flights, especially in such numbers, and in consequence the sleep of the residents being completely destroyed on the night.

This issue is reminiscent of the same lack of concern and understanding demonstrated so clearly by the 3 local councils when preparing and implementing the S106 in 2010. We have already suffered severely from considerable loss of sleep due to commercial and private night flights since 22-Oct-19, which I have reported monthly to LSACL between that date and the present month to ensure that the memory is maintained, without response. It is only since the end of March 2023, with 7 notable exceptions, that local residents have been able to enjoy their humanitarian right to an **almost** full night’s sleep (that is the 7.5 hours defined by LSACL between 23:00 and 06:30). Despite both the LSACL and LSACNF’s constant reference to the S106 night flight quota (which does not force any authority to actually apply it), a return to the devastation of the sleep of local residents must be avoided, and prevented at every opportunity from returning. This item is also raised by Lower Wells Avenue residents.

**Question: Why does the airport not restrict such commercial and private operations to daylight hours ? Why indeed do these aircraft operators not fly from other London airports, which are far more convenient and local to this event ? And in particular, why is the LSA “Noise Manager” not taking positive action against this disastrous proposal ?**

AOB is the appropriate place for items other than those on the agenda to be recorded. The airport is not obligated to share this type of business information but chooses to do so to be transparent with forum members. An update was provided during the meeting 23-04-24 and is recorded in the meeting minutes.

End of questions – Part 3.