

## LONDON SOUTHEND AIRPORT

### Minutes of meeting No. 107 of the Consultative Committee held on Wednesday 3 March 2021 at 2pm via 'Zoom'

---

<b>Present:</b> David Osborn	Chairperson
Glyn Jones (GJ)	CEO, LSA
Willie McGillivray (WM)	COO, LSA
Jo Marchetti (JM)	Community Affairs Co-ordinator, LSA
Colin Flack OBE	National Chair, UKACC (part-time)
Councillor Jeffrey Stanley	Castle Point Borough Council
Councillor Jacqui Thornton	Castle Point Borough Council
Councillor Jill Reeves	Essex County Council
Councillor Mike Steptoe	Essex County Council
Zhanine Smith (Officer)	Essex County Council
Ray Howard, MBE	Independent Representative
Councillor Damien O'Boyle	Leigh Town Council
Councillor Stephen Nunn	Maldon District Council
Councillor Daniel Efde	Rochford District Council
Councillor Mike Lucas-Gill	Rochford District Council
Councillor Ian Ward	Rochford District Council
Paula Chapman (Officer)	Rochford District Council
Councillor Daniel Cowan	Southend on Sea Borough Council
Councillor Meg Davidson	Southend on Sea Borough Council
Councillor Martin Terry	Southend on Sea Borough Council
Councillor Ashley Thompson	Southend on Sea Borough Council
Trevor Saunders (Officer)	Southend on Sea Borough Council
Cllr Carole Mulronev	Southend on Sea Borough Council (observer)
Les Sawyer	West Leigh Residents Association
Emma McDonnell (EM)	Secretary (Minutes)

---

#### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 No apologies for absence were received.

#### 2. MEMBERSHIP AND CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

2.1 The Chairperson welcomed members to the 'Zoom' meeting and commented that he was pleased so many members were able to join the discussions and went over the 'house rules/code of conduct'. The Chair also explained that the meeting would be recorded, simply to assist the Secretary in producing the minutes in case the internet was to fail. The meeting unanimously agreed to the recording taking place.

2.2 The Chair confirmed that to manage the meeting effectively and provide everyone an opportunity to raise any issues/questions, following his request, no questions had been submitted in advance of the discussions, but supplementary questions could be raised at the end of each agenda item.

2.3 The Chair questioned the attendance of Jacqui Thornton as she was not a member of the ACC. Councillor Stanley confirmed that she had been appointed as Cabinet member for Business at Castle Point Borough Council and felt it appropriate that she attend this ACC.

2.4 The Chair explained that Councillor Carole Mulronev had requested to attend these discussions as an 'Observer' and this had been granted.

2.5 The Chair welcomed everyone, and the meeting commenced.

### **3. VICE CHAIRMAN CANDIDATE**

3.1 The Chair explained that the position had been advertised on LinkedIn resulting in approximately 20 applications, which had been shortlisted to 4 by the Chair and GJ. Cllr Cowan was invited to join the selection process carried out via 'Zoom' and the forum was unanimous in their decision to appoint Murray Foster.

3.2 No objections were received to the proposal for Murray Foster to assume the role as Vice Chairman and his appointment was unanimously approved.

3.3 Murray Foster then joined the discussions and provided a little personal background.

### **4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING 11 NOVEMBER 2020**

4.1 The minutes were agreed and adopted with no amendments required.

### **5. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

#### Chapel at airport

5.1 GJ commented that he had met with the new priest at the church to take things further in relation to hopefully identifying an area at the Airport which could be converted to a small space for worship by multi-faith communities. GJ also commented that for obvious reasons, LSA continues to suspend all capex. GJ confirmed it was a constructive meeting and the new priest will visit LSA when operations resume. GJ commented that the priest will provide chaplaincy and help individuals in general with their wellbeing. GJ to provide update at the next meeting. **GJ 26/05/21**

#### Local road surface

5.2 A review of the road when travelling to the flying school was due to be carried out in the summer/autumn, in relation to the poor conditions of the road surface and will be addressed as part of the airport's plan to revise the layout of the area. WM confirmed that, as a result of the impact of COVID-19, all capital expenditure had been paused. Only those projects that are required by regulation or are safety critical will progress at this time. WM advised that all projects will be kept under review and will seek to progress when the impact of COVID has passed. WM confirmed no change – he will provide an update at next meeting. **WM 26/05/21**

### **6. UPDATE ON 'TRANSPARENCY SUB-COMMITTEE' MEETING**

6.1 The Chair updated the meeting on the principal issues arising from the sub-committee meeting held on 28 January 2021:

To summarise:

- Moving from Teams to Zoom
- Looking at the possibility of hybrid meetings
- Submitting questions in advance of 1/4ly meetings (supplementary questions still permitted)
- Constitution being amended to reflect that LSACC meetings (post Covid-19) will commence with a 15-minute time slot to allow 3 questions put forward by members of the public be raised and answered

- Proposal for a public event hosted by LSA (post Covid-19) to explain what the LSACC and the Airport can/can't do, ie a precis in layman terms of the LSA's S106 Agreement – it would also coincide with publication of the Airport's Annual Report. The Chair confirmed the suggestion is to hold the 1/4ly ACC meeting, and then follow on with the public event. The Chair asked the Committee if they would like to pursue this proposal and for it to take place on an annual basis?
- 6.2 Following a question from Z Smith, JM confirmed that there was no crossover of issues between this event and the Transport Forum.
- 6.3 The meeting was unanimous, and agreement was given to proceed as outlined above. **DO/JM/EM to action 01/09/21**
- Proposal for issuing minutes is that once the minutes of the 1/4ly meeting have been approved by the Chair, they are then emailed to members in 'DRAFT' form, requesting they are reviewed in detail with any factual inaccuracies sent to EM within a two-week timeframe. Once this process is complete and the Chair has reviewed any comments made by members, the minutes can then be published on the Airport's website in 'DRAFT' format until they are formally adopted at the next 1/4ly meeting, following which the Airport will substitute the draft document on the website with the adopted version. This will result in the minutes being in the public domain within approximately 4 weeks of the 1/4ly meetings taking place, as opposed to the current circa 12-week window
- 6.4 The meeting was unanimous, and agreement was given to proceed as outlined above. **EM to note.**
- Accessibility to ACC information on LSA website and update from JM re feedback following review of Aberdeen and Luton airports' websites, as their ACC explanations/layout are clear and user-friendly, which may be helpful for LSA.
- 6.5 Agreement was given for the 'Members & Representatives' document to be published on LSA's website as this simply has the names of councillors/officers and who they represent. **EM/JM 31/03/21.**
- 6.6 Cllr Ward requested that this information incorporates 'live' links to allow the user to find out more about the councillor/officer.
- 6.7 JM explained that there are other amendments to be made to LSA's website following Cllr Davidson's feedback and other comments made in the 'Transparency' forum, all of which may take a little time to implement as a third-party provider may need to be involved and there would be a cost to some elements. **JM 26/05/21.**
- 7. UPDATE ON 'REVIEW OF CONSTITUTION FEBRUARY 2014' INCLUDING MEMBERSHIP**
- 7.1 Following the 'Constitution Review' Sub-Committee virtual meeting earlier in the year, the proposed updated 'Constitution and Terms of Reference of London Southend Airport Consultative Committee' was forwarded to members prior to the ACC forum to allow them to see the changes being proposed.

7.2 The Chair explained that in 7.5 of the Constitution, it now states that:

*“Members of the public may be allowed by invitation to attend the section scheduled at the start of each meeting to ask a maximum of 2 questions per invite already submitted to the Committee and receive answers to those questions. The questions must be submitted in writing to the Chairman/Secretary, via the Airport website, at least 2 weeks in advance of the date of the meeting. The questioners will only attend for the part of the section of the meeting at during which their question is being considered. This will be limited to maximum 15 minutes of the meeting.”*

7.3 The Chair also confirmed that under 6.1 it now states: *“Non-attendance for 3 consecutive meetings then membership will be revoked on the next meeting of the Committee.”*

7.4 The meeting unanimously agreed and adopted the updated Constitution, and permission given to publish on LSA’s website. **EM/JM 31/03/21.**

7.5 EM to contact Essex Chamber of Commerce and Southend Trades Council, as they have not attended an ACC for a considerable period of time, to remind them of the next ACC meeting and establish if they wish to continue with membership. **EM 31/03/21.**

7.6 The Chair explained that the Airport is not a ‘member’ of the ACC, it is a permanently invited guest, and that the membership review process had yet to be completed as a further Sub-Committee meeting is required. EM to arrange a second Sub-Committee meeting for late March/early April to allow recommendations to be put forward at the next full ACC meeting. **EM to arrange.**

## **8. COMPLAINTS COMPARISON**

8.1 Cllr O’Boyle reiterated how seriously the ACC take their responsibilities in relation to noise complaints and environmental issues, which is reciprocated by the Airport. Cllr O’Boyle felt it would be helpful to understand data in a wider context and presented a PowerPoint illustrating comparative data (2013-2020) under two key metrics: Noise complaints and NO2.

8.2 Cllr O’Boyle showed passenger numbers by year group across six airports (LSA, LHR, LGW, STD, Luton and Bristol) ➡ then complaints p/’000 passengers. Cllr O’Boyle stated that LSA is an outlier in terms of complaints per 1000 passengers.

8.3 Cllr O’Boyle stated that the same is true for NO2. The level LSA is monitored against is 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and that all six airports are beneath that level. If, however, you split NO2 p/million passengers, LSA then becomes an outlier. LSA is significantly greater than other airports.

8.4 Cllr O’Boyle asked what tangible actions are being taken to resolve this? The majority of noise complaints relate to cargo movements. What actions are being taken by the Airport to ensure we do not see this huge trend and bring LSA much more in line with other airports, which it was prior to the cargo night flights?

8.5 Cllr Ward stated that the data was interesting and questioned why are there such differentials?

8.6 JM stated that the monitors around the Airport measure NO2 which is predominantly from road traffic. The NO2 figures during the pandemic have dropped slightly but not to the extent you would have thought considering there has been almost no flights. A lot of the NO2 generated around the Airport boundary is produced generally from road traffic use and not just passengers to/from the Airport. This is a significant piece of information missing from Cllr O’Boyle’s data.

- 8.7 Cllr Terry commented that JM made a significant point in that, for example, the works at the Bell House junction, this location had been identified under Government regulations as a very polluted area. JM is absolutely correct; this does distort Southend's environmental figures without doubt. Southend is by far the largest town in Essex.
- 8.8 Cllr Cowan stated that it was useful for the ACC to see the data presented by Cllr O'Boyle. He went on to state that JM makes a fair point in that there is a lot of pollution which is being measured coming from vehicles but there is further context to that – the TEA tubes can be affected by placement, sunlight etc and it's very difficult to say whether we are obtaining accurate readings in terms of what NO2 is being caused by vehicles and NO2 caused by aircraft. Any pollution is not good for anyone.
- 8.9 Cllr Cowan went on to comment that the data in relation to NO2 p/million passengers and p'000 ATM highlights that Southend is a very polluted town and anything the ACC can do working with the Airport, community and councils to improve this is going to be important. Cllr Cowan looks forward to seeing LSA's Environmental Action Plan.
- 8.10 Cllr Cowan advised that in relation to Noise, between 2014-2018 complaints p'000 passengers were remarkably similar to the other airports when averaged out (except Bristol as flight path avoids residential properties). Cllr Cowan stated that in 2019-2020, when you see the big increase in complaints, that's due to the night-time complaints. As a 'critical friend', the ACC should send a message to LSA that we are mindful of the impact those commercial activities have been having in terms of the number of complaints received.
- 8.11 P Chapman stated that it appeared from the data that the NO2 readings have been consistently high over the last few years, regardless of the cargo flights, which substantiates that it is predominantly road traffic causing the NO2 levels.
- 8.12 P Chapman asked that in relation to noise, if one person complains every night, is that counted as one noise complaint? Rather than complaints p'000 passengers, it would be helpful to see the breakdown as to how many complaints are received from per household.
- 8.13 Cllr O'Boyle agreed that in relation to NO2, there could be environmental background contributors to the data, and emphasised that all the other airports have both runway and outer-boundary NO2 monitors but sought clarification in relation to LSA's situation.
- 8.14 JM confirmed that it clearly shows in the Annual Report all four measuring sites which are on the boundary, but there is work that LSA is currently undertaking to investigate long-term installation of particulate matter monitoring on the airfield which will be to specifically measure emissions from aircraft.
- 8.15 JM stressed that it was worth noting that LSA's NO2 levels are consistently about half of the levels found along the A127 and in the town. Therefore, the levels around the LSA boundary are low in comparison to the rest of the town.
- 8.16 Cllr O'Boyle stated that given this background, to carry out a good comparable exercise, the data from the Airport's monitors within LSA's boundary would be needed.
- 8.17 JM concurred that the data LSA currently has is not comparable with other airports.

- 8.18 Cllr O'Boyle responded to P Chapman's earlier comment, in that you have regular complainants who will submit more than one complaint, and this is a common theme across all the six airports in that you have regular individuals submitting multiple complaints – there is no significant outlier.
- 8.19 GJ commented that he did not find the presentation particularly revealing for two reasons: the NO2 readings across all six airports were more similar than different in absolute terms. It is almost impossible to obtain perfectly comparable data due to topography, climate, physical constraints of an airport.
- 8.20 GJ stated that in relation to noise complaints, it is correct to say that all airports have a small number of individuals who regularly complain, but if you have a small number of passengers that has a disproportionate impact. GJ stressed that he is unable to affect the fact that 20 people submitted enough complaints in ten days this year to have exceeded all complaints in 2018! What he can do is deliver, consulting with a number of councillors, a robust Environmental Action Plan, ie minimise use of reverse thrust on runway at night, reduce use of auxiliary power units from 30 to 15 minutes etc. It is how LSA manages the balance between the downside with the upside of an airport.
- 8.21 Cllr O'Boyle stated that NO2 data is available by passenger and ATM which are both acceptable metrics for measurement and that GJ was correct in that currently we cannot accurately compare data across the airports but it's important in the context of LSA's growth ambitions, that you are not going to see a linear increase, but you are going to see an increase in NO2 if you are going to increase passengers to 10-12 million.
- 8.22 Cllr O'Boyle went on to say that there are regular complainants, but the numbers for LSA did not jump until the night flights, particularly night-time cargo.
- 8.23 GJ pointed out in relation to NO2 that the 80 million passenger airport example provided is only just at the government limit. As LSA is not planning to be anywhere near that large, it is difficult to understand the concern Cllr O'Boyle expressed about its growth. Moreover, LSA is only at 50% of the government limit and has seen a reducing trend in NO2 over many years, despite increases in passenger numbers. Any relationship between growth and NO2 levels is not, therefore, obvious.
- 8.24 Cllr Davidson thanked Cllr O'Boyle for the presentation, stating it was obvious that the complaints p/000 passengers related to specific events: 2013 runway expansion and 2020-night flights. Cllr Davidson went to say that she didn't believe anything new had been learnt, and proportionately LSA has had far fewer passengers in 2020 and night flights have continued, and lots of complaints continue to be submitted, so you can't link the two things together.
- 8.25 Z Smith stated that with regard to night flight restrictions, it might be helpful to provide context in relation to any variation with QC rating of aircraft in Southend. How noise efficient aircraft are, and that information could be put forward as part of the night restrictions consultation currently live with DfT.
- 8.26 JM reported that noise comparisons are not particularly helpful on a local basis – the LSA reporting is far more detailed than that presented by Cllr O'Boyle. Taking complaints per passenger, one of the spikes recently is due to cargo flights – the number of complaints has spiked but no passengers are involved in that data. The number of complainants is important to LSA but what is critically important is what is happening around Southend in terms of complaints, not on a wider basis. The data being collected is about individuals from Southend and it is the community the Airport wishes to focus on. JM went on to stress that as Cllr Davidson alluded to, the first spike related to the runway expansion, then the increased frequency at the jet centre (not a huge number of passengers), then the introduction of Ryanair, and then the spike relating to cargo flights. Not all are passenger related.

8.27 Cllr O'Boyle replied that he couldn't agree more that it was the impact on the local community, and he was presenting the figures because he didn't believe everyone had been party as to how the figures compare against other airports. Cllr O'Boyle stated that he did not want the p/'000 passengers to be a red herring as the same is true per ATM and could provide this information if needed.

## **9. BACKGROUND/OVERVIEW OF UKACC**

9.1 Colin Flack, National Chair of UKACC, introduced himself, commenting that it was an interesting debate on noise and NO2, and he has his ACC Birmingham meeting on 4 March, when some similar trends will be seen.

9.2 C Flack summarised that:

- UKACC is a collaboration of Chairs of ACCs;
- It does not try to represent views of all ACCs;
- UKACC identifies collaborative schemes it can help take forward to inform DfT
- It acts as a focal point for all ACCs, for example, C Flack has acted as Chair at other ACC meetings due to sickness, helped ACCs with Constitutions. Each week it provides newsfeeds to keep everyone informed;
- UKACC provides DfT with an insight into what's happening on the ground with ACCs - the current relationship UKACC has with DfT is the best it has ever been.

9.3 The ACC produces an incredible forum and currently the DfT doesn't get the best out of it. C Flack advised that he has a meeting with the Minister of Transport next week to set out the national landscape.

9.4 C Flack reported that he is working with LHR as they've had to change their structure – they are now moving away from the Heathrow Community Engagement Board and are reverting to an ACC model. The challenge for everyone is that it is an opportunity to steer where ACCs are able to go in the future. LHR is going to have an impact on other airports. C Flack does not like the term ACC – it does not give the impression that anyone can participate, therefore, UKACC is looking at alternatives around changing the perception of ACCs.

9.5 C Flack then went on to talk about the ICCAN 'Best practice for engagement between airports and communities on aviation noise'. ACCs were disappointed with the phraseology in the report. In the past, the DfT has not fully grasped the value and reach ACCs have, and the UKACC's challenge is to right that and shape DfT a little better. For example, looking at reporting structures, how can UKACC who are independent, help gather data from the mass variety of sources, and share information better and use it positively.

9.6 C Flack reported that ICAAN is under review. With the pandemic, the whole need for ICAAN is being evaluated. It is fine looking at noise, but there are multiple trade-offs to reducing noise. There are numerous facets to consider, ie questions from a commercial aspect, society needs regarding employment and sustainability to reduce pollution etc, and the concept of ICAAN solely focussing on noise, takes the debate in one direction which is not helpful.

9.7 The Chair expressed his appreciation to Colin for attending and providing this helpful insight.

## **10. CAA'S ANNUAL REPORT ON ACCESSIBILITY PROGRESS AT UK AIRPORTS IN 2019/20**

- 10.1 WM explained that in April 2019 the CAA changed the methodology in relation to how to measure the 'Passenger with Reduced Mobility' (PRM) service. The CAA is now requiring data for every single passenger - historically, aggregate data has been provided. The new required measurement can be carried out simply for departing passengers, but it is complicated to measure an 'arriving' journey. For example, an aircraft arrives at 11pm and 3 PRMs are onboard. Previously, LSA would have taken the last passenger and obtained the data for that person then calculated what collectively all 3 of those passengers would have experienced. For example, passenger 1 may be dealt with within two minutes, passenger 2 in three minutes, passenger 3 in five minutes, and LSA would have submitted five minutes for all three passengers, but now it needs to provide data for each passenger and LSA is struggling to find a methodology for this and one sufficiently robust to satisfy the CAA.
- 10.2 It has taken a long time to identify a methodology acceptable to CAA and just as LSA was reaching a positive position, the pandemic arose. The CAA's Annual Report covers the period up until March 2020 and the feedback to LSA is that they have not been able to provide sufficient robust data, particularly in 'arriving' passengers. The Airport has now entered into an agreement with CAA and employed a data analyst to keep the CAA up-to-date and provide a monthly report – LSA is satisfied with these steps in going forward, but currently has no passenger data because of the pandemic.

## **11. DFT NIGHT FLIGHTS CONSULTATION**

- 11.1 The Chair reported that this has been extended until 31 May 2021 and believed the ACC as a group should complete the questionnaire and proposed to do this with 2-3 ACC members, to present at the next ACC 1/4ly meeting on 26 May for approval before submitting.
- 11.2 Approval was given to proceed on this basis and the Chair will send an email to members inviting 2-3 representatives to assist with the survey completion. **DO/EM to arrange.**
- 11.3 GJ stated that the Airport company has already submitted a response and would share a copy with the ACC for information if available, as it was an online submission. **GJ 15/03/21.**

## **12. SURFACE IMPACT ACCESS ROUTES**

- 12.1 JM reported that there is the Annual Airport Transport Forum next week and are happy for the ACC to have membership on that forum – the Chair has been invited and accepted. The outcome of the forum will be discussed at the next ACC meeting. **JM 26/05/21.**

### 13. AIRPORT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Committee reviewed the report prepared by GJ, covering the period November 2020 to January 2021.

#### (a) Performance

The report contained the following performance figures:

Total aviation movements	November 20	December 20	January 21	Total
<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2,957</b>	<b>2,129</b>	<b>1,285</b>	<b>6,371</b>
2019/20	3,115	2,684	2,716	8,515
<b>Commercial movement 2021</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>1,098</b>
Commercial movement 2020	1,970	1,926	1,691	5,587
<b>Passengers 2021</b>	<b>1,190</b>	<b>1,244</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>2,881</b>
Passengers 2020	132,848	149,579	124,544	406,971

#### (b) Overview

- 13.1 GJ reported that activity deteriorated markedly as the winter progressed and progressive restrictions in the UK and elsewhere were introduced. Passengers were more than 99% down on the previous year, with no passengers at all from January 9th, as the virus, quarantine, the evolving testing regime, lockdowns and other constraints on movement in European countries, reduced passenger confidence and therefore demand. Load factors were extremely low as airlines continued to struggle to stimulate demand (both at London Southend and elsewhere) even with the lowest fares.
- 13.2 The UK is the worst affected in the EU in relation to passenger traffic.
- 13.3 GJ explained that the impact on the Airport was and continues to be exceptionally serious. With almost no passengers, and a cargo operation much reduced from January, revenues were around 90% below the previous year. The Airport continues to use furlough to the greatest extent possible to offset staff costs but with, broadly, two thirds of the Airport's costs fixed, the financial implications are severe. The Government support scheme, whilst welcome, is very limited in scope. Business rates, at which it is capped in practice, represent no more than 5% of the Airport's costs. The financial outlook, therefore, is exceptionally challenging.
- 13.4 Nevertheless, the Airport operates on the basis of an expectation of a return to at least a reasonable level of demand in the Summer of 2021 so rather than reduce its workforce further, the Airport is in fact recruiting in a number of areas, including functional management, security and Air Traffic Control. It remains to be seen whether, when and to what extent demand returns, with challenges to vaccination programs, the evolution of viral variants and the different strategies of worldwide Governments to address those circumstances all combining to create an uncertain outlook. However, the Airport's underlying assumption is for short haul demand to and from London to return in Summer 2021 to around 50% of the 2019 level, increasing through the Winter and into 2022 as some of the challenges are resolved.

- 13.5 Cargo operations increased in volume in the Autumn and early Winter before falling back in January, post Brexit. Even so, cargo remains, currently and at least until the end of Winter (April 2021) virtually the sole source of the Airport's income. Cargo movements are expected to end the business year (March to February) around 9% down on the previous year for the comparable operating periods (October-February). This does not reflect in any way the quality of the operation, which acts as a reference point for the customer. Rather, it is a function of operational challenges deriving from our new trading relationship with Europe. It is anticipated that volume will return to pre-Brexit levels by the Summer, as underlying demand remains strong and the administrative questions have been answered. Cargo movements are still running year to date at slightly above the 10% limit specified in the S106 agreement, albeit for reasons completely outside the Airport's control.
- 13.6 A less visible but equally important issue is the difficulty in maintaining "recency" for members of the Airport team, which could lead to difficulties when demand does return, especially in Air Traffic Control. The Airport is encouraging general aviation traffic to manage that risk and also ensuring it has appropriate visibility with DfT and the CAA. Training activity has helped to minimise risk in relation to "recency".

(c) Airline Business

- 13.7 Airlines are pushing back the start dates for operations and at the same time reducing the capacity they put on sale because, for the reasons outlined above, demand is not returning at the rate hoped for. It now seems unlikely the Airport will see material operations until the Summer, with Spring schedules increasingly limited. Bookings are being made very late (if at all) and that reduces the available period within which to make sales, mitigating against capacity allocations which might be perceived as risky. However, the Airport continues to hold constructive discussions with both existing and target customers. In an environment where demand is difficult to generate, LSA's very low-cost base is attractive as it supports demand stimulation through low pricing. It is also clear that underlying demand does exist but is being suppressed by both the virus and policy, with the latter adding cost through quarantine and testing requirements. As a consequence, whilst LSA remains confident of a recovery through the Summer, it may well be that the Summer will be defined as starting later than the IATA definition of the end of March.

(d) Operations

- 13.8 The passenger terminal is now closed and will remain so until late March at the earliest. It is well equipped for safe travel when services resume and LSA continues to train staff, especially in the use of the new CTiX equipment, to ensure that the passenger experience is as good as it can be, accepting that Covid-19 will remain a factor in travel for some time to come. The Airport is now providing two testing facilities at its premises, supporting the NHS and also providing a private PCR facility on a not-for-profit basis. With no scheduled passengers either now or in the immediate future, the Holiday Inn is not being called upon as a location in which to quarantine "red route" arrivals. However, should the list of routes be expanded, as is possible, that could change. Although under historical circumstances we could see a substantial mismatch between arrivals and the number of rooms available at the Holiday Inn for quarantine (129 in total), the strong probability is that demand will be so suppressed that if self-funded arrivals quarantine remains in place that the risk is small.
- 13.9 On a more positive note, the Airport received an extremely encouraging audit of its safety management system from its regulator, the Civil Aviation Authority. Despite having a number of the team on furlough, LSA has moved its management of aerodrome safety forward very positively. Less encouragingly from a regulatory point of view, LSA's airspace change proposals have slowed in their progress, in part due to what appears to be a limited resource base in the regulator and in part due to Brexit-related challenges on issues such as satellite access. LSA is not alone in its frustrations, with several other airports withdrawing applications due to the delays leading to a requirement to resubmit data and attendant cost.

## 14. PLANNING ISSUES

The AOD's report included information about the following planning issues:

(a) Future Projects

- 14.1 LSA's appeal against the refusal to grant consent to build a new hotel is progressing and should be complete within three months.
- 14.2 Works on the next generation hold baggage screening project continue and are still scheduled for completion by June of this year.
- 14.3 The Airport has been successful in its application for a Port Infrastructure Fund grant to support the transition of its cargo operations through Brexit. Although LSA has not as yet received any payments, and the grant itself is subject to tight conditionality around the detail and timing of delivery, it should enable the Airport to ensure that its response to the new requirements for import and export around Brexit are addressed effectively.
- 14.4 GJ commented that the number of cargo movements in the reporting quarter is 39% down on the previous year.

## 15. INWARD INVESTMENT, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Included in the AOD's report was information relating to inward investment, employment and training.

(a) Employment and training

- 15.1 LSA is recruiting for the Summer in both the Airport and the cargo operation but against a background of considerable uncertainty. The Airport's mitigation is job offers without firm start dates, but the elapsed time required for security clearances and training means that they cannot delay too long without risking having insufficient staff in some areas to provide quality service. This will be kept under very close review as more information about airline schedules emerges over the forthcoming weeks.
- 15.2 Discussions then took place on some members' views on vaccine passports, including ethical issues and caution into rushing into anything without considering ramifications. GJ stated an international coordinated data driven approach is needed.
- 15.3 Cllr Nunn asked GJ what percentage of recruitment is from the local community to which GJ stated circa 85%, majority are in cargo or Airport security operations. WM confirmed that LSA is determinedly focussed on finding local recruits. Apprentice ATC for example cost £100K per head to train. Sourcing young and local candidates is the best way to retain talent and LSA has a campaign which looks locally around school/college leavers, with a starting salary of £20k, once trained increases to £60k.
- 15.4 Cllr Ward enquired how ensuring pilots are airworthy due to the pandemic would interfere with the Airport being fully operational. WM stated that in relation to Ryanair and easyJet they have kept pilots flying but on shorter contracts. LSA has ensured ATCs keep current and are in a good place in that pilots and the ATC community are all ready to go, just need passengers.

## 16. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Included in the AOD's report was information relating to community relations.

### (a) Noise

- 16.1 Due to the constraints of remote working during the Covid-19 pandemic, on 20 March 2020, the ACC approved a short-term solution for recording and processing noise complaints.
- 16.2 As part of a major upgrade to its Noise Complaints Handling Service, London Southend Airport has implemented a new online self-service complaint system called "WebTrak" which enables the user to view all aircraft movements in the vicinity of Southend Airport to see what aircraft flew where and what height. WebTrak went live on the LSA website on 3 November 2020.
- 16.3 A new Noise Complaints Handling Procedure (incorporating WebTrak) was presented to the ACC on 11 November 2020 and approval was received from the ACC Chair 15 January 2021.
- 16.4 For a trial period of 3 months (starting 3 November 2020) LSA offered both WebTrak and the on-line noise submission form. Noise complaint data includes complaints submitted via WebTrak and the on-line submission form.

### **WebTrak feedback**

16.5 Initial feedback from one WebTrak user:

- No time and date of the complaint within the auto-response email (only flight reference number) - actioned and RESOLVED.
- Height measurement - the height readings displayed on WebTrak were rounded up to the nearest 100ft – this was the default setting. The WebTrak team reconfigured the height setting so that the rounding up/down is switched off. Height recordings are taken every 4 seconds along the flight track. RESOLVED.
- Missed infringement - upon implementation an ASL breach was not identified as non-compliant. LSA relies on back-office Noise Desk system and ATC records to track NPR compliance so this infringement was still recorded. Incident was immediately investigated and RESOLVED.
- Metric used for distance - there is not currently an option to switch between km and nautical miles on the WebTrak system. Km is the official metric used in Britain since 1965 however the imperial system is still commonly used in aviation. 2.5 nautical miles is equal to 4.63km.

16.6 Plus, one comment from a Hockley resident regarding light aircraft circuits:

- Dispute accurate height of aircraft as she was comparing it to data from a mobile phone app. Explanation provided (mobile phone apps are not as reliable as WebTrak which receive data from aircraft transponders and LSA secondary radar - this information is also available on the LSA website WebTrak page).

16.7 No comments/feedback received about difficulty using the system or submitting noise complaints via WebTrak.

16.8 JM advised that unless there are any questions/feedback following the separate report previously circulated to ACC members, LSA is looking to implement Webtrak as an approved system as of 4 March and remove the existing online submission form and replace it with the alternative online submission form via Webtrak.

- 16.9 Cllr O’Boyle asked if, based on the numbers in the report, we have seen a sufficient shift across to Webtrak.
- 16.10 JM stressed that until LSA can publicise Webtrak there is not much awareness. Of all 718 Webtrak complaints (Nov 20-Jan 21), these have been submitted from individuals finding it on LSA’s website but once the system is formally implemented, then LSA can promote it and highlight the system to the community. JM went on to explain that following on from Cllr Cowan’s suggestion at the last ACC meeting, the Airport will be relocating the Webtrak link on its website to the top of the noise page.
- 16.11 Cllr O’Boyle stated that being able to locate Webtrak is integral and questioned whether we are reserving the right to revisit this issue should we find that the community is in uproar about accessing Webtrak, ie are we going to keep a close eye and review in 3 months’ time to ensure it is embedded in correctly?
- 16.12 JM replied no. The ACC is responsible for being consulted on noise complaints procedures, the Airport had consulted with the ACC and the meeting was supportive. LSA ran a three-month trial along the other reporting system, of the 718 complaints received via Webtrak, only two individuals provided initial feedback, and these were resolved. JM went on to stress that other UK airports use Webtrak successfully which would indicate it is user friendly, easily accessible, and efficient.
- 16.13 JM reported that the total number of noise complaints for the Q4 period November, December and January 2021 was 3,785. This excludes 55 complaints for which no aircraft could be found to be operating at the time of the complaint.
- 16.14 In the Q4 period 2,534 (67%) of all complaints were from 20 people and 918 complaints (24%) were received from just 3 addresses.

Date	Complaints	NOT SEN	Total	Night	Day	Total complainants	Total by top 20	% by top 20
Nov 20	1,561	- 23	1,538	1,266	272	129	1,056	67.65%
Dec 20	1,582	- 24	1,558	1,335	223	114	1,033	65.30%
Jan 21	697	- 08	689	657	32	86	445	63.85%
Total Q4	3,840	- 55	3,785	3,258	527		2,534	67%

- 16.15 2,780 complaints related to aircraft operating to/from the SW over Leigh-on-Sea and 932 complaints related to aircraft operating to/from the NE over Rochford. (73 complaints related to helicopters, overhead aircraft and ground noise which are not runway direction specific).
- 16.16 86% of all complaints are about aircraft operations during the night-time period. Of these, 95% relate to the logistics operation.

Date	Night	Biz jets	Jota	ASL (cargo)	HM Coastguard	Police	Calibration
Nov 2020	1266	5	1	1206	44	3	7
Dec 2020	1335	7	59	1266	3		
Jan 2021	657	4	21	623	9		
Total Q4	3258	16	81	3095	56	3	7

16.17 All complaints for the Q4 period were investigated and the aircraft in question were fully investigated.

16.18 133 night-time complaints related to 4 aircraft that were non-compliant i.e. turned early and broke NPR controls.

### Mobile Noise Monitoring

16.19 JM summarised the background. To date, the mobile monitor has been used to investigate aircraft noise levels inside a classroom at a local primary school located directly under the SW flight path and to monitor noise levels from various runway works and other airport development activities. In summer 2019, some local residents (Wells Avenue) requested the use of the mobile noise monitor, due to the nature of the residents' concerns, and with the residents' agreement, LSA employed an independent noise specialist company to conduct a comprehensive noise study of their specific location and provide a full report which included consideration of a noise barrier.

16.20 JM reported that no other formal requests for the mobile monitor had been made to LSA although there has been some discussion on the topic during previous ACC meetings.

16.21 In January 2021, the LSA Noise Manager received a request from a local resident for the mobile noise monitor to be deployed at their specific address. LSA has contacted the resident to offer the mobile monitor and a meeting to discuss their specific noise concerns.

16.22 To improve community engagement on noise issues and provide greater transparency on mobile noise monitoring, LSA is proposing to agree a formal process for agreeing locations and advertise this on the LSA website under the Noise section. The procedure was circulated to members prior to the meeting for their detailed review.

16.23 JM emphasised that LSA should be approached for a monitor (there is no requirement for a request to be made via the ACC), and would keep members updated. The report covers how other airports manage mobile noise monitoring, what the mobile noise monitor (NMT) actually is, legal matters, process for agreeing NMT location etc.

16.24 JM confirmed that once any feedback was provided from the ACC, then the formal procedure will be available on LSA's website so members of the public can see how to request an NMT.

16.25 Cllr Cowan stated that he had personally requested, on multiple occasions, the deployment of a NMT - in February 2020 during a meeting with GJ, and also via SBC's S106 officer. Cllr Cowan could not confirm if the request via the S106 Officer had reached LSA, but SBC has made those requests. Cllr Cowan went on to comment that he has responses from LSA advising a NMT is not necessary as a report has already been provided in relation to Wells Avenue.

- 16.26 JM replied that there was a discussion during the February meeting, but the location for which a request was being made (Wells Avenue), a comprehensive noise report had already been provided. It was not a new request; it was in relation to Wells Avenue where a comprehensive noise report had already been supplied.
- 16.27 Cllr Cowan confirmed that no requests for a NMT had been made via the ACC, but that doesn't mean requests haven't been made.
- 16.28 Cllr Mulrone (observer) commented that she had submitted a request for a NMT on behalf of a resident in Leigh which was passed to a monitoring officer. Cllr Mulrone appreciated that there is a process to follow but people tend to come to local councillors which is a natural thing to do but will refer residents with future requests to LSA's website. Cllr Mulrone raised concern that if previous requests have not been fed through to the Airport then this is an issue she will need to pick up with Southend Borough Council.
- 16.29 JM concluded that with the formal procedure available on the LSA website, this should hopefully avoid any further confusion.

### **NPR Fines 2020-2021**

- 16.30 During the 2020-2021 reporting period, fines to the value of £3,000 have been issued in regard of non-compliant departures. An outstanding fine of £1,000 from the previous year was collected 11/03/20 resulting in a total of £4,000 being made available to the ACC sub-committee to decide which local charities they wish to donate to.
- 16.31 L Sawyer explained he had consulted with Cllr Cowan (Cllr Adrian Fluker is no longer an ACC member) and they decided to distribute funding to the following charities;
- NHS Southend ambulance station - £1000
  - Health screening Carli Lansley Foundation - £1000
  - Intensive Care Ward Southend hospital -£1000
  - Rochford Ward Southend hospital - £1000
- 16.32 L Sawyer explained that the sub-committee felt that in the exceptional and unprecedented year in dealing with Covid-19, it seemed appropriate to give something to the people who have worked so hard and faced unimaginable working conditions in caring for desperately ill patients.
- 16.33 A Teams meeting with the chosen charities took place for the funds to be distributed within LSA's 2020-21 financial year.
- 16.34 To make it more democratic, L Sawyer asked for a representative from each of the remaining principal councils (Rochford, CPBC and Maldon) and to advise EM accordingly. **EM 31/03/21.**
- 16.35 Cllr Nunn put forward his name to represent Maldon.
- 16.36 JM also confirmed that in addition to the NPR funding, at a charity event involving walking/running the runway, the Airport raised £7,000 for local, small charities.

(b) Environment.

16.37 GJ reported that in late January, LSA received certification to Level One of the Airport Carbon Accreditation scheme. The Airport has committed to be carbon neutral through that scheme by financial year 26 (February 2027 at the latest) so this first step is very welcome, as it sets a baseline for future improvements. LSA has also committed to establish and report on Particulate Monitoring at and around the Airport this year and have begun the procurement process to acquire six monitoring stations, which is market leading in London (see 8.14). The Airport is preparing to establish a Community Noise Forum, independent of the Airport, utilising ICCAN guidelines and input, to provide a new, widely based community voice on airport noise.

16.38 More broadly, LSA will publish its Environmental Action Plan (EAP) this year, specifying objectives, strategies and actions over the next five years in a range of environmentally relevant areas. The Airport fully recognizes that alongside the very substantial economic benefits it delivers, it also generates environmental impacts which it needs to mitigate to the greatest extent possible. It will never be possible to satisfy every requirement, but it is possible to find a balance between economic benefit and environmental impact, which is what the EAP sets out to do (see 8.20).

## **17. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 AGREEMENT**

17.1 The Quarterly Section 106 Return for the three-month period November, December 2020 and January 2021 was reviewed - there were four NPR breaches for the quarter. JM explained that infringement notices had been issued and went on to summarise the circumstances behind each breach.

17.2 JM summarised that it was a technical situation in that the pilots thought they were following the correct procedure, but after it being brought to their attention things have improved, although one further breach has been identified.

## **18. PRESS PACK**

18.1 Not available as a virtual meeting.

## **19. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

19.1 Cllr Lucas-Gill informed the meeting that he is not seeking re-election in May so this will be his last ACC meeting, and wished the Airport well for the future stating that he had enjoyed his time on the Committee.

## **20. DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS**

The next Committee meetings, starting at 2pm, are as follows:

Wednesday 26 May 2021 via Zoom

Wednesday 1 September 2021

Thursday 18 November 2021

**The meeting ended at 4.15pm.**

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_