

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

Present: Mr Colin Flack OBE – Chairman

In attendance from Birmingham Airport Company:

Nick Barton	- Chief Executive
Andy Holding	- Corporate Responsibility Manager
Nikki Bains	- Head of Planning, Transport and Strategy
Tom Denton	- Head of Sustainability
Rosie Bishop	- Environment Specialist
Jon Davies	- Energy and Carbon Manager
Simon Evans	- Head of Corporate Affairs & Marketing

In attendance from Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council:

Mr L Stevenson	- Representing the ACC Secretariat
Balsall Common Village Residents Association	- Mr D Ellis
Balsall Parish Council	- Cllr K Tindall
Barston Parish Council	- Mr D Elliott
Berkswell Parish Council	- Cllr R Lloyd
Bickenhill & Marston Green Parish Council	- Cllr J Horton
Birmingham City Council	- Cllr D Donaldson
Castle Bromwich Parish Council	- Cllr J Macdonald
Catherine de Barnes Residents Association	- Mr D Cuthbert
Hampton in Arden Parish Council	- Cllr D Sandells
Hampton in Arden Society	- Mrs J Hilton
Kingshurst Parish Council	- Cllr M Dawson
Knowle Society	- Mrs E Baker
North Warwickshire Area Committee of Parish Councils	- Cllr R Habgood
Shard End Communities	- Mrs M Ball
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	- Cllr R Grinsell
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	- Cllr J Butler

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

Passengers Representative	- Mrs R Tyler
Warwickshire County Council	- Cllr M Watson
Warwick District Council	- Cllr G Illingworth
Wychwood Club	- Mr G Heaps

Apologies were received on behalf of: -

ABTA	- Mrs S Foxall
Consumers Association	- Mr T Baker
Coventry City Council	- Cllr K Miks
Chelmsley Wood Town Council	- Cllr S MacDonald
Fordbridge Town Council	- Cllr D Cole
Staffordshire County Council	- Cllr M Deaville

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS BY THE CHAIRMAN**

The Chairman welcomed Members of the Committee and representatives from the Airport Company. Apologies were as noted by the Secretary and the Airport Company.

**RESOLVED**

That, the Chairman's welcome and recorded apologies be noted.

**2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING & MATTERS ARISING**

The Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee, held virtually on 3 March 2022, was submitted. There were no matters arising.

**RESOLVED**

That, the Minutes of the last meeting be agreed as a correct record.

**3. CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**

The Chairman provided his regular update to the Committee on current industry issues and his role as Chairman of UKACC's. Headline issues this time included:

- Ongoing discussions as to how UKACC's would be funded going forwards. There were presently 25 members of that collaboration.
- Recent agreement with the DfT that UKACC's would now produce and publish an Annual Report to give greater public awareness to airport operations and greater general transparency across the UK.
- The functional areas from the former (ICCAN) Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise was now being picked up, in part, by the (CAA) Civil Aviation Authority in their Environmental Sustainability Panel. The member composition of that Panel was considered of significant importance to its future work and success. An announcement (the Panel) was expected in the near future.

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

- The DfT's recent announcement relating to their strategy: Flight Path to the Future, together with ongoing dialogues with the current Minister for Aviation on a number of matters and the positive relationship that was developing with him and his department.

**RESOLVED**

That the Chairman's update be received and noted.

**4. PRE-SUBMITTED QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE & MATTERS ARISING**

The Committee was advised of the following pre-submitted questions:

**Question - Hampton in Arden Parish Council (Cllr D Sandells):**

**Question 1** "Following the confirmed vortex strike on Eastcote Lane on 19th May, could the team let us know when that general area was last risk assessed and, if so, whether any proactive work as part of the Wake Vortex Protection Scheme has ever been carried out in the vicinity of Eastcote Lane."

**Answer:**

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) – drew the Committee's attention to the discussion arising from the Sustainability Report which provided an answer to this question.

**Questions - Catherine de Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert):**

**Question 1** "Referring to the customer satisfaction section of the report where it states: "Security has been impacted due to lower than required resource levels, resulting in vulnerability when uncertainty occurs outside of normal operations" - can this statement be clarified?"

**Answer:**

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) – advised that:

"Essentially, we have limited capacity to react when unusual situations arise that you can't plan for. Good example would be that the media coverage of queues at airport has exacerbated the problem by causing people to arrive sometimes more than five hours early. This then adds unexpected volume into the peak which adds to the queues and compounds the issue. For example, passengers who may be booked on a 10am departure would normally arrive 7am which is after our peak. They arrive at 5am or 6am meaning they are adding unnecessarily to the queues."

In addition to the above, the Airport Company (Simon Evans) highlighted the impact that the media was having on passengers, adding to the reported operational pressures and causing unnecessary stress amongst passengers. The Chairman also added that the effect of the media was being seen nationally and was adding, unnecessarily, to the operational pressures by causing passengers to arrive far too early for their flights. Those scenarios resulted, unfairly, in reputational damage to the airports themselves.

**Question 2** "Referring to the aircraft On Time Turnaround target set at 70%, I appreciate things are difficult currently but is this a target that contributes to improved performance?"

**Answer:**

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) – on behalf of Kalpesh Singhadia, the Airport Company's Capacity Manager, advised that:

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

“The OTT targets were set in 2019, when we averaged 69% for the year prior to COVID restrictions coming in – so we feel that the target is appropriate. Unfortunately for this year we will miss the 70% mark significantly due to the extra COVID checks at check-in, security delays and now GH/airline delays due to their resourcing. The appropriateness of all our KPI targets is reviewed every year.”

**Question 3** “Referring to the use of PM10 as a measure of Air Quality, PM10 is very generous as a limit – are there plans to review the particulate level PM2.5, which is more relevant in monitoring and improving air quality?”

**Answer:**

The Airport Company (Rosie Bishop) – advised that:

“Both PM10 and PM2.5 were now monitored via the on-site ambient air quality station. Improved monitoring had been undertaken since mid-2020 when monitoring equipment upgrades had been undertaken. All air quality data was publically available via the Air Quality England website, reported on a monthly and annual basis.”

“It was proposed to report PM2.5 (and any exceedances) to the ACC on an annual basis for ongoing transparency.”

**Questions - Berkswell Parish Council (Cllr R Lloyd):**

**Question 1** “Concerning statistics relating to Passengers of Reduced Mobility, these questions may be of interest to Members to appreciate the overall challenge for the Airport and airlines”.

- a) “Are there statistics on the proportion of passengers who are classed as PRM?”
- b) “What is the proportion of passengers who travel with a wheelchair?”
- c) “Is there any breakdown according to travel type or how these proportions have changed over time?”
- d) “I'm aware there are developments aimed at allowing passengers to take their wheelchairs aboard the aircraft.””

**Answer:**

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) - on behalf of Ed Kibblewhite, the Airport Company's Accessibility Operations Manager, advised that:

“The% of PRMs vs total PAX was 1.58%, up from 1.35% in May 2019. Original planning and forecasting of how much resource needed had changed significantly.

“May's breakdown by category was:

- Passengers who can't manage long distance - 46%
- Those who can't manage stairs / steps - 44%
- Those requiring a full carry to their seat - 5%”

“All of those either had their own chairs or required use of an airport chair. Compared to 2019, there had been a 7% increase in those who could not manage stairs. This was the category that generated specialist vehicle demand and had contributed to service issues with the vehicle side of the operation.”

“Overall pre-notification rate (all airlines) was only 64% at -36 hours. Work was in progress locally and through the CAA to drive airlines to send information earlier but many were resistant or unable.”

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

“True ‘ad-hoc’ requests (requests made on the day) was currently at around 25% compared to 5% in 2019. That was being impacted by airline resource difficulties meaning there were issues in pre-arranging assistance. That meant that, in the past, a higher % of requests were still received and already in the system at the time of the flight arrival. Many more now were needing to be called through after the general passenger offload was complete and that added to the queue of existing requests. It was considered likely that many of the current media stories are from situations like this.”

“We also had a higher number of movements now from carriers that did not use air bridges as standard than in the original schedule/forecast for this year. That meant the Airport Company had to react and source two additional vehicles to cope with the increased volume which are yet to be delivered.”

### **Discussion Points**

The Chairman – advised the Committee that he was aware that the uplift of unannounced requests for PRM assistance was being seen at other airports and was not just limited to Birmingham. It was also clear that the PRM assistance system was being abused at the current time.

Warwick District Council (Cllr G Illingworth) – highlighted the need to recognise passengers with hidden disabilities. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) highlighted the success of the sunflower lanyard for that category of passenger and the support interventions for them. The issues reported had an impact on all categories of PRM’s and genuine users of those assistance services.

Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr D Ellis) – highlighted his concerns regarding the number of unannounced requests for PRM assistance and asked if the airlines should be doing more to request that information from passengers well in advance of travel. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) advised that a small proportion of passengers would always be genuinely unaware that such a service existed regardless of how much publicity their airline gave to it. At the present time, some of those genuinely wishing to use the PRM assistance service were unable to book that provision through their airline as they were allowing telephone calls to go unanswered.

Catherine de Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) – referred to the sunflower lanyard initiative and asked if there had also been an uplift in their usage (i.e. the recognised effect of COVID on mental health etc). The Airport Company (Andy Holding) agreed to investigate that question with Ed Kibblewhite and report back.

Kingshurst Parish Council (Cllr M Dawson) – asked if, at the current time, it would be helpful if passengers used their own wheelchairs to reduce the demand on the Airport’s own equipment. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) referred back to the answers to Cllr Lloyds questions above which cited the use of own wheelchairs and those provided at the Airport. For some passengers, the Airport’s wheelchairs were not suitable and in those circumstances the use of their own wheelchairs was more appropriate. A high proportion of PRM passengers were not full-time wheelchair users and requested assistance due to general mobility issues given the distance some passengers had to walk to get to their flights.

### **RESOLVED**

- (i) That the pre-submitted questions and responses given by the Airport Company be noted and received;
- (ii) That Ed Kibblewhite, the Airport Company’s Accessibility Operations Manager, be invited to the next meeting to give a presentation on his area of responsibility and the current position with PRM’s; and

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

- (iii) That PM2.5 (and any exceedances) be reported to the Committee on an annual basis for consideration and review.

**5. AIRPORT ACTIVITIES REPORT**

The Airport Company (Nick Barton) - presented the new format of the Airport Activities report for the period January to March 2022. The report set out quarterly updates on the following matters:

- Passenger Statistics.
- ATM's
- Aviation Development.
- Key Stakeholder Engagement.
- Complaints Statistics.
- PRM Performance.
- Customer Satisfaction.
- Social Media.
- Security Wait Times.
- Immigration Performance.
- Baggage Delivery Performance.
- Cleaning Performance.
- On-time Turnaround Performance.

**General Updates**

When introducing the report, Mr Barton drew the Committee's attention to a number of additional headline issues. In summary, this included:

- The demand for air travel had returned strongly since government restrictions had been removed and the current ability of the industry to cope with that demand was currently being outstripped.
- In November and December 2021, the Airport Company attempted to recruit for vacant posts on the assumption that, in the Spring, business recovery would begin to be seen. Due to the uncertainty around job security and ongoing travel restrictions, there was very little interest in those vacancies. In contrast, similar recruitment activities at the end of February 2022 (as restrictions were being lifted) attracted significant interest and the demand for jobs at the Airport recovered quite strongly.
- Following recruitment, staff training and security screening was typically a 12-week process before staff would be deployed into the secure working environment of the Airport. In contrast, the demand for passenger flying (once the government restrictions had been lifted) was instant. The choice as to how much passenger capacity was flown was made by the airlines themselves with little consultation with airports to ensure ground staff were in place to service those flights.
- In January 2022, the business was operating at 34% of pre-COVID levels. February had increased to 53%, March was 63%, April was 74%, May was 78% and June was forecast to be circa 80% (1M passengers going through the Airport).
- The challenge was now to offer a regulated, safe and secure environment in parallel with the expected standards of customer service. Not all aspects of key airport operations and services were under the direct control of the Airport Company.
- For the current financial year, the numbers of required staff had now been recruited, and training and screening was being undertaken as quickly as possible to enable

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

those staff to be deployed. As and when new staff were being deployed, they were having an immediate positive material impact on the performance of passenger throughput.

- Media coverage had caused incredible levels of stress in some passengers. In some cases, passengers had been arriving many hours too early for their flights which had added to the operational issues, land side, to support those passengers.
- Customer service performance standards were below target but they were still at an acceptable level. Due to media coverage, expectations amongst passengers were lower and whilst performance levels were clearly much lower than target, they had still been better than the expectation of the passenger which had inadvertently helped de-stress that relationship.
- The reported problems were expected to continue in the short term but on a lower and ever decreasing intensity. To date, Airport Company staff had been undertaking additional duties in the security hall during busy periods to aid passenger throughput.
- Staff resilience levels would also improve over the coming months. An example of a fire alarm triggering the requirement for a supervised evacuation of the immigration hall and the level of staff required to fulfil that was given together with the consequential impact on other services in the security hall. Low levels of staff resilience was also being seen across the wider aviation industry.
- Current judgement for the business was that the recruitment plan was ahead of schedule and the staff training programme was going well; all initiatives to restart the business were successful and the Airport was now delivering a much more consistent operation for the passenger. Overwhelming feedback was that the passenger services offered were well organised. Some business passenger traffic was still challenging as the fast-track product was still not available in the short term and would not be switched back on until confidence levels were such that a fast-track product would deliver that level of service.
- Flight cancellations, particularly last minute cancellations, were difficult to manage operationally with limited staff and that often resulted in a poor experience for the passenger. Examples of flight cancellations were given in terms of how they were managed by the airlines and how they were reported in the media in contrast.
- There was a high level of confidence around the Airport Company's role in the delivery of the 2022 Commonwealth Games which had been in planning for over a year. A whole series of interventions would be deployed in the run-up to the start of the Games. First and last impressions were considered very important although the number of passenger movements directly associated with the Games was considered relatively modest in contrast with normal Airport operations and usual daily passenger movements.
- Current oil prices were reported as being potentially problematic for industry recovery. A number of airlines were either fully or partially hedged to safeguard against their increased costs and passengers were still wanting to fly. However, there was still some uncertainty as to how much of that demand would be sustained beyond the Summer in light of the cost of living crisis.
- A higher proportion of passengers was now being seen as declaring themselves as Passengers of Reduced Mobility (PRM's) in an attempt to deceive and avoid queuing. This had an impact on genuine passengers that needed that level of service.

**Discussion Points**

Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (Cllr R Grinsell) – advised the Committee of his professional background as a travel agent. Highlighting that much of Mr Barton's update

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

related to departures, Cllr Grinsell stated that frustration amongst passengers also related to arrivals and delays with baggage reclamation. The Airport Company (Nick Barton) updated the Committee on the regulatory constraints for ground handling and the typical contractual arrangement between the airline and their ground handling company (with the exception of Jet2 who undertook all ground handling activities themselves). Specifically, for problems seen with arrivals, Mr Barton informed the Committee that those related to passengers on flights that had been delayed. Referring again to workforce resilience at the present time for certain airport operations, when flight schedules were disrupted or cancelled, this had an impact on the ability of ground handling staff to service those aircraft quickly and, very regretfully, resulted in the delays to those passengers. The Committee was advised that "Surge Teams" had been established (and employed) by the Airport Company to identify and react to those ground handling pressures. The greatest focus for the Airport Company at the present time, in terms of service risk, was reported as PRM's and passenger baggage; both would remain a key focus going forwards. In conclusion, Cllr Grinsell stated that it was unfortunate that the above problems were a negative reflection on Birmingham Airport when, in fact, the problems were the responsibility of the airlines themselves and their contractual partners.

Balsall Parish Council (Cllr K Tindall) – highlighted his own experiences with two recent flights and advised that, upon departure, the Airport staff who were managing the queues were exemplary. On arrival for one of his recent flights, Cllr Tindall had waited 3 ¾ hours for baggage return and there had been no visible presence from his airline (Jet2) within the terminal for a period of two hours which he perceived was very poor service. In response, the Airport Company (Nick Barton) advised the Committee that Jet2 were an excellent operator with extremely high levels of customer service. Having regard to the problem described, it was anticipated that something unusually significant had occurred within their ground handling operations on that particular occasion.

### **Planning and Transportation Updates**

The Airport Company (Nikki Bains) reported updates on the following headline issues:

- Air Traffic Control Tower illumination and Emirates branding.
- Security Hall proposed extension and associated operational improvements.
- New access road from A45 Coventry Road.
- Surface Access Strategy refresh.
- New (UGC) Multi Story Car Park.

At this point in the meeting it was recorded that Cllr R Grinsell and Cllr J Butler (both representing Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council) were Chairman and Vice-Chairman, respectively, of that local authority's Planning Committee. Nothing in the arising discussion related to any views or opinions given towards the determination of any planning application currently under consideration.

### **RESOLVED**

That, the contents of the Airport Activities Report for the period January to March 2022, be received and noted.

## **6. SUSTAINABILITY REPORT**

The Airport Company (Tom Denton, Jon Davies and Rosie Bishop) presented the Sustainability Report for the period January to March 2022. The report set out quarterly updates on the following matters:

- Sustainability Update.



**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

- Noise Violations.
- Night Flying Policy.
- Engine Ground Running.
- Air Traffic.
- Aircraft Activity Complaints.
- Air Quality.
- Waste (Recycled).
- Energy.

In addition to the above, the Committee's attention was also drawn towards the following specific headlines for this report:

- Earth Day – and the launch of the Sustainability Statement of Intent 2022/23.
- Green Ambassador Award.
- Wake Vortex Strikes and the Vortex Protection Scheme 2022/23 phases.
- Net Zero Carbon Plan – launched on 12 April 2022
- Greenhouse Gas Accounting 2021/22 – the “confirmed” results was reported as an increase of 12% from 2020/21.

### **Discussion Points**

Warwickshire County Council (Cllr M Watson) – highlighted section 5.2 of the report and noted that track-keeping performance was still to be calculated due to a prolonged period of reduced resource. Cllr Watson recalled that this had been the case for some time now and asked for an update as to when this data would be available for the Committee to consider. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) advised that this was still work in progress and that aspect of the report required a considerable amount of time, resource and expertise to compile and interrogate the data from the ANOMS system. The Committee was reassured that data was still accessible and available to investigate and respond to individual complaints in the interim.

North Warwickshire Area Committee of Parish Councils (Cllr R Habgood) – highlighted the “perception” of on-track and off-track flying and asked the Airport Company for their view on the accuracy of flight track data (with App's such as Flight Radar 24 etc) which, on occasions, gave the impression that aircraft were flying certain routes when the reality could be very different. The Airport Company (Tom Denton) advised that App's, such as those, were poor in terms of flight path accuracy and were indicative resources only. The ANOMS system, in contrast, was extremely accurate and full reliance on aircraft flight data was afforded to the that system when investigating complaints of potential off-track flying. The ANOMS system also used the same radar-feed as that used by Air Traffic Control, hence the reassurances given regarding the accuracy of that system.

Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (Cllr J Butler) – highlighted a number of perceived factors that could affect on-track flying and the perception of aircraft distance and noise from the ground. The Committee acknowledged that a residents perception of noise and overflying had been affected as a result of the pandemic and, especially, now that airport operations were gradually returning to normal levels and a new baseline was becoming evident.

Hampton in Arden Parish Council (Cllr D Sandells) – sought confirmation that the Vortex Protection Scheme was “reactive” and also enquired how neighbouring properties were protected against future risk. The Airport Company (Rosie Bishop) explained that “connected” roofs with neighbouring properties were also covered under the Vortex Protection Scheme when repairs were prioritised and scheduled. Cllr Sandells also asked what risk assessments were carried out by the Airport Company to other properties in known

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

locations where strikes had occurred. The Airport Company confirmed that this type of activity was not undertaken.

Barston Parish Council (Mr D Elliott) – recalled the vortex wake strike on the property (actually located in Barston) and complimented the Airport Company on the fact that the repairs had been carried out within 24 hours. Mr Elliott also highlighted that this had been one of only two vortex wake strikes in that locality in the last 25 years and the perceived future risk of reoccurrence was, in his view, very low and any risk assessment would be of little value.

Catherine de Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) – asked the Airport Company for an update on their Sound Insulation Scheme and was advised (Tom Denton) that there was no live Scheme at present and a review was currently underway as everything within the existing noise contour had been completed.

Warwickshire County Council (Cllr M Watson) – highlighted the installation of on-site renewable electricity generation and asked the Airport Company if this included battery storage as well as solar panels to avoid energy wastage. The Airport Company (Jon Davies) advised that from the modelling undertaken, this confirmed that all potential energy generation, as part of the current Study, would be utilised. For future and other areas, battery storage would be considered as a better alternative to exporting surplus energy.

Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr D Ellis) – highlighted section 3.3 of the report; usage against 877 departure cap (23.30 to 05.00) and corrected the date reference as printed as 2019/20 to 2021/22. At section 6.2 of the report; trends in types of concerns reported, the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2021 was out of sequence with the remainder of the report data. The points raised were noted by the Committee and the Airport Company.

**RESOLVED**

That, the contents of the Sustainability Report for the period January to March 2022, be received and noted.

**7. AIRSPACE CHANGE PROCESS (SID REMOVAL) – VERBAL REPORT**

The Airport Company (Tom Denton) advised the Committee that the Airport Company were obligated to remove their reliance on ground-based Nav aids by 31 December 2022, and needed to address a number of SIDs to achieve this. They were: DTY4F, TNT4G and TNT1K, (Trent SIDs to the north and Daventry to the south) all contained within the Aeronautical Information Package (AIP). They were designed specifically for use when Birmingham's Air Traffic Control had no access to surveillance radar. The Airport Company recently deleted their procedures for operating without radar, so had no procedures by which they could use those SIDs. Mr Denton explained that, to his knowledge, they had not been used at all since the inception of BAATL on 1 April 2015, and probably not for some time before then.

The Airport Company were not seeking to redistribute any traffic to other SIDs; they simply wanted to delete three SIDs that were never used. In addition, they were re-starting the Airspace Change Process (ACP) for SID WCO2Y to the south. That SID removal was started before the COVID-19 pandemic and had to be paused. That departure route was very rarely used; up to 40 times in any given year by positioner flights (empty aircraft departing the airport to be repositioned into service at other airports).

All the SID deletions outlined were reported as procedural and in line with the CAA requirements of CAP 1616 and did not require a formal public consultation as there was no impact in terms of environment or noise.

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

The Airport Company were also renaming one SID to the north UMLUX 1M, and changing it to BRUMI 1M to reduce any possible confusion with other SIDs by aircraft crews; again no formal consultation was required.

All deletions and changes were expected to be completed by September 2022. The Committee noted that there would be no impact to aircraft movements and, therefore, no additional impact to residents on the ground.

**RESOLVED**

That the contents of the report be noted.

**8. AIRCRAFT NOISE & NIGHT FLYING POLICY REVIEW - VERBAL REPORT**

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) advised the Committee that, arising from a discussion at the Committee's Steering Group, early interest had been expressed in the Night Flying Policy Review. The discussion had also widened to Aircraft Noise in it was agreed to bring a general update to the ACC. In summary, the Committee was advised:

**Aircraft Noise**

- The volume of noise complaints remained relatively low. Q1 2022: 56 complaints (up from 40 in Q1 2021). In comparison Q1 2020: 258; Q1 2019: 69; Q1 2018: 213 and Q1 2017: 258.
- Expectation that as air traffic recovered (and for a number of historical and physical factors) the Airport Company would see a rapid and large rise in complaints but this had proved not to be the case.
- As a means for measurable evidence, no clear trends were emerging as an indicator for aircraft noise.

**Discussion Points**

Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr D Ellis) – highlighted that the Airport Company had been very proactive in posting information on their website and informing communities (via the ACC Members) about airport activities which might explain why the expected rise in complaints about aircraft noise had not been seen.

The Knowle Society (Mrs E Baker) – stated that she was aware that some residents, despite being tolerant, had current perceptions regarding departure routes being different to those flown pre-COVID. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) stated that aircraft were still flying to the same procedures and there were no clear complaints trends emerging from any local community. Track data (ANOMS) helped investigate complaints such as off-track flying.

Shard End Communities (Mrs M Ball) – observed that many members of the community accepted that as airport operations restarted and began returning to normal levels, there would be some noise and disturbance associated with that. Communities had got used to relative silence in comparison since March 2020.

Barston Parish Council (Mr D Elliott) – recalled the current situation with his own community and the effects of overflying and the noise associated with it. Mr Elliot stated that airport operations had a greater effect on the community of Barston since the runway extension was built.

Hampton in Arden Parish Council (Cllr D Sandells) – highlighted the use of (commercial) helicopters was a growing concern and asked if they had to fly an approved SID. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) advised that the Police helicopter would fly the most operationally viable route on departure and would aim to follow a standard arrival route on returning. For commercial helicopters, the Airport Company undertook to liaise with ATC to gain further

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

statistics to report back, acknowledging that the ACC may want to look at this issue in more detail at a future meeting (including the permissible use of drones too).

Warwick District Council (Cllr G Illingworth) – highlighted that aircraft flying today were less noisy than older aircraft. Cllr Illingworth asked if there was any suggestion that residents may have become more sensitive to noise given that that airport operations had near stopped and were only just beginning to return (and the A380s had still not restarted). The Airport Company (Andy Holding and Tom Denton) advised that the airlines were largely using the same aircraft fleets, pre-COVID with a few exceptions.

Catherine de Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) – stated that the Catherine de Barnes Residents Association had advised their residents when airport operations were restarting which may have limited the number of complaints with that advance information. Mr Cuthbert also highlighted a number of other major civil engineering activities within or near to his community which may be diverting resident's attention away from the Airport at the current time.

### **Night Flying Policy Review**

- The key Policy in mitigating the impact of aircraft noise in surrounding communities. Effective 23:30hrs to 06:00hrs.
- Voluntarily introduced and subsequently transposed into the Section 106 Agreement with Solihull MBC.
- 3-year cycle – the current Policy was agreed in 2017/18, in which Members of the Committee were heavily involved.
- Current Policy effective from 28th October 2018 and lasted until 31st October 2021. The impact of the pandemic made a meaningful Review impossible to achieve.
- Agreement with Solihull MBC, with the support of the Committee, that it would be rolled over (unaltered) for a further three-year period.
- Next Review due to be completed and implemented by Autumn 2024 (commencing late 2022/early 2023 resource dependent).

At this stage, the Airport Company (Andy Holding) asked for expressions of interest to join a future ACC Working Group to consider the Review. The Committee unanimously supported this approach again.

### **RESOLVED**

- (i) That, the contents of the verbal reports be received and noted;
- (ii) That, the Airport Company obtain data from Birmingham Air Traffic Control in regards to commercial helicopter departure and arrival routes and to report back to the Committee on those findings;
- (iii) That, the proposed approach to undertake the next Review of the Night Flying Policy be supported; and
- (iv) Initial ACC Working Group expressions of interest: Mr D Ellis, Mr D Cuthbert, Mrs R Tyler and Cllr R Habgood (other expressions of interest to be notified to Andy Holding).

## **9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The following matter was raised by the Committee:

**BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT - AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**9 JUNE 2022 AT 1.30 PM**

---

Catherine de Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) – asked the Airport Company (Tom Denton) how Birmingham’s ACC compared with that of Gatwick ACC. Mr Denton advised the Committee that, in comparison, Gatwick ACC had a far greater number of Members and general attendees. The level of engagement between their Committee and the Airport Company was also less positive in comparison with Birmingham. Mr Denton added that Birmingham’s ACC was, in his, view an excellent example as to how an ACC should operate effectively. There was evidence that the Committee had a constructive relationship with the Airport Company and mutual respect existed between both parties and amongst the Committee Members themselves. Mr Denton concluded that the Committee was a credit to everyone involved and he very much looked forward to working closely with the ACC going forwards.

**RESOLVED**

That the agenda item noted.

**10. DATES OF NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Thursday 01 September 2022 at 13.30hrs and would be held in Meeting Room One at Diamond House, Birmingham Airport, B26 3QJ

**RESOLVED**

That the date of the next meeting be agreed and noted.