



Meeting Wednesday 18 October 2017

Present (Members):-

- |                     |     |  |
|---------------------|-----|--|
| • Andrew Swayne     | AS  | Chair                                      |
| • Clive Burghard    | CB  | Lancing Parish Council                     |
| • Jon Rollings      | JR  | GB Met College                             |
| • James Scott       | JS  | ASAL (In Administration)                   |
| • James Crabbe      | JEC | Fixed wing users                           |
| • Audrey Old        | AO  | Lancing and Sompting Residents Association |
| • Maurice Pitchford | MP  | Shoreham Beach Residents Association       |
| • Jonathan Candelon | JC  | MD BCAL                                    |
| • John Davies       | JD  | Rotary wing users (Helifly)                |
| • Mark Milling      | MM  | Lancing College                            |
| • Tim Dray          | TD  | Ricardo                                    |
| • Chris Drew        | CD  | West Beach Residents Association           |
| • Andrew Edie       | AE  | SAOTA                                      |

In attendance (guests/ presenters):-

- |                |    |                                 |
|----------------|----|---------------------------------|
| •              |    |                                 |
| • Martin Smith | MS | Tavis House Properties          |
| • Martin Perry | MP | New Monks Farm Developments Ltd |
| • S Crawford   | SC | PRC Architects                  |

In attendance (supporting officers):-

- |                   |    |                       |
|-------------------|----|-----------------------|
| • Christine Smith | CS | Secretary             |
| • James Appleton  | JA | Adur District Council |
| • Moira Hayes     | MH | Adur District Council |

1. Apologies from:-

- |                   |    |                                    |
|-------------------|----|------------------------------------|
| • Richard Heywood | RH | SAOTA – represented by Andrew Edie |
| • Emma Evans      | EE | Adur District Council              |
| • Hazel Thorpe    | HT | Worthing Borough Council           |
| • Brian Boggis    | BB | Adur District Council              |
| • Max Woodford    | MW | Brighton & Hove City Council       |

2. Minutes of last meeting:-

Minutes of the last meeting held on 12 July 2017, having been previously circulated, were agreed that they were a true and correct record of that meeting.

### 3. Matters arising (not covered elsewhere):-

#### **Membership –**

AS told the meeting that Kevin Boram from WSCC (member) should be here and that a replacement for Barry Smith (WSCC officer) has not yet been found. He added that there was an amendment to the agenda and that James Appleton will update us on the Adur Local Plan.

### 4. **Local Plan update**

JA reported on the Adur Local Plan. He told the meeting that the Inspectors' Report had been received and would be going to the Joint Strategic Committee shortly and would be placed in front of the full council on 14 December 2017. Assuming the Council approves, the plan becomes formally adopted six weeks after the full council meeting.

The Inspectors have a shortfall in housing and want a minimum of 600 houses. He had also put minimum commercial space requirements without an explicit upper limit. AS enquired when the plan would become public and JA replied that if the council agree, it will be after 14 December. MH said they were carrying out minor modifications so that there would be no major surprises and it is all on their website. JA added that the Inspector says it is a good plan. AS then asked both developers to explain their plans and how they affect the airport. Discussions should be about the airport and stakeholders. It was understood that the planning committee would hear both planning applications after the local plan was adopted.

### 5 **Travis House Presentation including benefits to and issues for the Airport**

MS then explained that he had been appointed by Albemarle Shoreham Airport Ltd (ASAL), that airports are in essence industrial estates and that the principal occupier is there for the long term. Also that airports have land and that there is a great need for space. An Application has been entered for the site to the North East of the Airport which measures 13½ acres and this is in conjunction with Ikea and NMF. There are a few objections to date, under 2 headings. Ecology and Traffic. He stated that the airport is donating 8½ acres to the sea wall so this issue is defensible. With regard to traffic, extra traffic generated is an issue. There is currently a minimum of 500 cars per day using the airport as a rat-run and this is going to stop in consultation with the airport users. AS then commented that people will be interested in the type of tenants and the traffic changes. JS then replied that Cecil Pashley Way is a private road but used as a public road but that between 500 and 1000 cars a day can be diverted. A scheme is to be designed to stop rat-runners. He is expecting objections from users of the A27, Old Shoreham Road, but added that there will be no road closures and that he is engaged in detailed discussions. MS replied that Cecil Pashley Way is a private road so joggers, cyclists and rat-runners may not be insured. JS then explained that Cecil Pashley Way must not be over-used and told the meeting that the airport was grid-locked after an accident in Shoreham. He said that this will not happen again.

There will be a 12m buffer between the road and buildings and there will be a screen of trees. JS then added that they are diverting significant amounts into the airport but if they don't get planning, this money won't happen. MS reported that the Distribution sheds are large but that it is employment space.

#### **Discussion**

AS then enquired about the viability of the airport. He said that this plan was very important and asked if there was any risk to the airport if the plan didn't go ahead. JC replied that it was all inter-linked and that the airport indirectly benefits from the development. JS then stated that they had just let Premier House only because £0.5 million pounds is being spent on refurbishments. Without the hope of future profitability, this wouldn't happen. MS replied that Industrial estates need money spent on them. JS replied that he had committed £½million each to Premier House and the Municipal Hangar and £250,000.00 to the old Ricardo building.

CD then asked if all businesses on the airport have to be aviation related. JS replied in the negative and added that they have to be B1c, B2 or B8 and then subject to planning where there is not a general consensus for anything non-aviation. The old Ricardo building is going to a non-aviation business and this has been approved by the planners. MP added that airport planning restrictions are changing. JC stated that the Landlord prefers aviation business and that around 50% is airport related users. JA explained that other users would be looked at as long as they didn't affect the aviation use. He added that there was a link between the applications as they are all inter-related. MM then commented that there would be less traffic after the access and JS replied that if the applications are separated, meetings would have to be held regarding access to the Sussex Pad. MP added that they were very supportive and stated that the new access is much better for the airport. JS then explained that, as airport owner, they have seen enough data to know that if NMF is agreed, the traffic access to the airport will be much better. Also, the airport is using pumping equipment which won't be used as much once the tidal wall scheme is completed and also the new NMF drainage solution and pumping station is built.

JEC then commented that he was concerned that that the focus and prime purpose of the SACC was losing its direction. He pointed out that it was formed so that the members were kept briefed of developments that directly affect the current and future operations of BCAL. That is Shoreham Airport! This enabled members who were not directly involved in airport operations to have a voice on any matters that may concern them and their opinions could be heard.

He continued that the purpose of the SACC is not to be involved in matters outside its remit. In this case the continued discussions regarding the Monks Farm Estate/IKEA and the ongoing matters with HE regarding traffic management etc. Whilst these subjects may be of major concern to Lancing College and Ricardo, also various local Residents Associations by these members of the SACC, they should not be allowed to take precedence over matters of direct importance to the owners and operators of Shoreham Airport.

CB asked, regarding the roundabout, if anyone had considered fly-overs? AS replied that he co-chairs the Worthing and Lancing A27 Working Group and added that the scheme put forward by HE was not popular so they have asked HE to go back to the DfT and they will hopefully hear something in the foreseeable future. He added that we need a whole road network solution, that it was unforgivable that they put the scheme out there without any air quality data.

## **6 NMF Presentation including benefits to and issues for the Airport**

MP then showed the meeting a drawing of the NMF development, he told the meeting that this is to be a high-quality development and that a new drainage system is to be installed. A new roundabout will serve NMF, Ricardo and the airport. Access will be much improved for the airport and the A27. With this new junction, the area will unlock, not gridlock

He said that the NMF developments has a north/south border with the airport. He added that the plan is at an advanced stage and, if planning was refused, they could appeal as there is a presumption to grant an application which met local plan objectives. This site is going to be developed and is a minimum of 600 houses, 28 hectares of country park, 16 sites for a new traveller park and a new school. The Ikea plan is for a new store, not warehousing, and is included in the plan together with the new junction. HE wants to reduce conflicts on the A27 and want to get rid of the traffic lights at the Sussex Pad junction. We have projected traffic flows until 2027 and designed an access route with plenty of room for traffic expansion. It also improves access to the South Downs National Park. He said that the issues raised were as follows:-

**Transport** – HE and WSCC consulted and looked at the impact of these plans and issued a statement that the network was fit for purpose.

**IKEA** – Traffic will be less than local plan assumptions in the morning as the store is closed and will be up by 1% in the evenings. 74% of visitors to IKEA come from the east and 24% from the west which equals 1 additional car every 2 minutes. NMF's traffic consultants also work for IKEA and

have actual figures and data from IKEA stores that are already open. HE have accepted the figures and NMF are very confident that traffic flow data is robust.

**Drainage** – The whole site including the airport is in a flood plain. Tidal walls will help to protect the whole area from river flooding. Ground-water comes down from the north and runs underneath to the southern out-fall near the Dogs' Trust. Both out-falls are tide-locked every 6 hours. NMF are going to divert the water out to a pumping station over the top of the tidal wall, 24 hours a day. Groundwater to the south is being monitored every 2 minutes and discharge to the south will remain the same. This plan improves the A27 and Manor Close and picks up surface water generated on Cecil Pashley Way, which benefits the airport.

Overall Benefits – the two developments together generate £182M, plus income to the council will increase by around £25M. The country park is the largest park to be created in 85 years and will be the same size as Buckingham Park. There will also be a new helipad at the airport. JC reported that these developments will have no effect on the grass runways although there was concern over future noise complaints. The helicopter circuits are to be adapted if required in consultation with the helicopter operators.

## **Discussion**

AS then asked if there would be any impacts on the flying operations. JD replied undoubtedly. AS continued and said that we wanted to see the roundabout as far east as possible with east/west access. MP replied that the roundabout is east/west but that the committee recommendation is not part of the plan. He added that they had put a case to HE regarding Combes Road but they had refused to let the Combes Road traffic lights remain.

JA commented that the roundabout location was on the cusp of NMF land and airport land. AS replied that the roundabout is as far east as it could be. If airport related traffic is not using the Combes Road, then HE have a point.

JS told the meeting that MP had been consulting the airport for some time, the plans will not affect the grass runways and we are working together to resolve helicopter circuits. Consultation with the operators will start in the next month.

JEC commented that building houses and a new IKEA is a benefit for all but that any house purchaser should have "Caveat Emptor" in their contracts. Runways 24/06 are very close to the house developments and noise will increase, so they should be "Buyer Beware".

JC commented that there was no reason for the airport to object to the planning applications but that he was concerned that people will move in and start to complain about the noise. Flights will not be over the new houses but existing ones.

JA replied that they are engaged with noise consultants and environmental health officers who are satisfied with noise levels.

JD stated that a noise survey doesn't include helicopters.

JC reported that a noise survey had been done on helicopters at NMF and is included in the planning.

JD replied that he is very positive about things but represents the rotary wing users. This airport produces people with extra knowledge and skills.

JC stated that the airport is safe-guarded.

AE enquired about safety issues.

JEC stated that the fixed wing users were not against the plans at all and just want the best for the airport.

AS and JC stated that their prime concern is the airport and work very closely with the CAA but cannot discuss this here,

JA stated that the CAA had not raised any concerns about the plans.

AE then asked if a 14m high building is safe from a flying perspective.

JS then said that he knew AE had written an objection about turbulence and JA stated that nobody raised any objections to flying operations in the Local Plan application about 3 years ago.

AE stated that we needed to be sure that the CAA don't have a problem.

JS replied that that is what they do and JC added that we consult with them all the time.

1. JS told the meeting that building height scale and mass had been designed with CAA requirements in mind.
- 2.

JS added that all buildings will be at the designated distances.

JA explained that they were looking at height parameters.

JC added that our airport is not in the government's safe-guarding plan.

AS stated that applicants have to consult with key people as part of the process and JA had to consult with a number of bodies including CAA.

JC commented that sometimes the media get fed inaccurate or misleading aviation-related topics and anyone that contacts the media should be sure of their facts before communicating them.

JS added that when Southern Water did the 100m stretch recently, the CAA were very interested,

JR commented that the college don't want a detrimental impact on the students or the college and added that the more investment in the airport, the better.

CB said that his main concerns were the flood plain and flooding, traffic congestion and pollution. He added that this is an historic airport and is very important to many people and industrial development should be to the north of the airport.

MP stated that the residents of Shoreham Beach worry about the effect of the traffic on the A27 will have on the A259.

JS replied that there will be no heavy-duty traffic going through the south entrance to the airport because of the low bridge.

MP said that within the infrastructure plan, junctions on the A259 are to be improved, in discussions with HE and WSCC.

AO stated that, from Lancing's point of view, the A27 is heavily congested east to west every evening.

CD reported that the plans for the north-east development included the words "short-term future" with respect to the airport and he is concerned about the airport's long-term future.

JS replied that he is already addressing the short-term future and that the point of the development site is that it will benefit the airport.

JC then stated that the airport operations stood on its own feet economically.

JS then told the meeting that BCAL allow a music festival annually that raises income. He added that the landlord have not requested any of that income which contributes to the airport and that he is doing everything possible to help the airport. We cannot develop the airport as we are administrators but we are spending £60,000 on signage.

CD asked MP if the drawing he was holding was the plan. MP replied it was the planning application and that they had no intention of increasing the number of houses on the site. He added that there were 180 affordable units and there will be no change to those either.

JA explained that sometimes the County Council make provisions to the plans. Their advice to them has been to build the school on site and that the country park will be written in a legal agreement as public open space.

MP then explained that the red line on the map will be a green security fence and that they would ensure that it's all built and maintained property, including the country park.

TD told the meeting that Ricardo are supporting both plans and asked if the tidal walls project has been looked at for impact on the airport.

JC replied that there have been many meetings regarding trucks, cranes etc.

MM reported that Lancing College wanted the airport to succeed and flourish but had concerns about the impact of 2,000,000 cars.

MP assured him that there would be possibly 2,000,000 visitors not 2,000,000 cars.

### **Conclusion re Applications**

AS stated that in conclusion that we support the airport and JS's and MS's plan for the north west of the airfield. He said that we want to see the NMF plans proceed and that we have noted that there isn't east/west access on the north side of the roundabout. We support the applications as they enable the airport to thrive, the plans and the airport. It was also noted that for wider reasons, some members still wanted to see a full access to the Coombes Road.

### **AOB**

JD then stated that he had been attending these committee meeting for 3 years and has never attended one when a representative from BHCC has attended.

AS replied that the officer from BHCC would hopefully be at the next meeting on Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> November and had only recently started his role.