

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport
Airport User Group Meeting
Wednesday 14th January, 2015

MINUTES

Present:

Alastair Mackinnon	AM	Wolverhampton Airport
David Howell	DH	Private Owners
Roger Hawkins	RH	Private Owners
Andy Clarke	AC	The Flying School
Les Richardson	LR	The Flying School

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Dave English (PDG), Ben Cook (NPAS) and Steve Wilkes (Hadair)

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting dated 24th September 2014 were accepted without amendment.

3. Matters Arising

AM reported that the works required to reopen taxiway 'B' had been done but the quality of the works was not satisfactory; it was hope that the outstanding faults would be corrected shortly. Other areas on the aerodrome were also awaiting remedial work.

4. WASIRs

AM reported on three WASIRs raised since the last meeting.

Two concerned runway lights being hit; one was a solo student in a tail dragger and the other was at night due to the poor markings on runway 34. The 16/34 markings were discussed under item 10.

The other WASIR had been raised due to aircraft maintenance work taking place in a hangar which was generating sparks. AM noted that maintenance work should not normally take place inside the hangars and certainly no work that would generate sparks.

5. Security

There had been no security reports raised since the last meeting.

6. Complaints

AM reported on five complaints received since the previous meeting.

The first was in relation to circuit traffic overflying Swindon. It was agreed that this should not normally happen but could when there was a significant south westerly wind and runway 16 was in use. It was thought that this was most likely to be an issue with student pilots.

One complaint was about the Harvard doing aerobatics over the field. It was agreed that this aircraft type is noisier than most; the aircraft concerned is not based here at present.

Two complaints were about a military helicopter overflying properties on the approach to runway 16. This complaint is regularly received, only in relation to a specific operator, and is the result of the operator flying a precise circuit. It is not clear that any solution to this is available.

Finally a complaint about an aircraft repeatedly flying low level over Bridgnorth on a Sunday evening was not considered to be a matter for us as the airport had been closed at the time.

7. Path by Hangar 4W

DH had reported a request for this path to be completed had been made again. AM apologised for the repeated delay and confirmed that it was still intended that this path would be extended.

8. Fuel Installation

RH had reported a suggestion that the fuel hoses should be on hose reels rather than left on the ground.

A number of issues were raised. AM noted that there were hose reels in position but no one seemed to recall a time when they had worked. The existing reels were not considered to be worth repairing. AM asked if people thought that people would use new hose reels if they were installed – either the wind up variety or one of the sprung loaded ones. The sprung loaded reels were not popular and people felt that the manually would reels would not be used.

Two issues were raised about the current layout. Firstly, that the hose could be dirty and this meant that people got their hands dirty during fuelling. Secondly, the hoses were sometimes left obstructing aircraft taxiing areas. It was suggested a line could be painted on the ground to indicate where the hoses shouldn't be left.

As far as cleanliness of the hose was concerned it was felt that people would drag the hose along the ground whatever facilities were provided. AM will investigate gloves similar to those provided in petrol filling stations.

9. Instrument Approaches

AM reported that the designs, safety case and validation plan had been submitted by the end of the year as required by the ACCEPTA project timings. It was not possible to give a firm date for implementation of the approaches.

There was some discussion about the degree to which the ATZ would need to be sterilised for such approaches and AM said this would form part of the discussions still to be had; it was currently considered that this needed to be weather related and he would keep the Group informed.

10. Any Other Business

AM noted that the painting of runway 16/34 had been delayed as it had not been known whether it should be painted as an EASA instrument runway or a CAA instrument runway. Now that this is known, paint had been obtained and the painting will be done as soon as the weather conditions permit. This will include the marking of the turn off points to runway 04/22 and 10/28 which should help to protect the lights.

LR asked about the colours used for the new hold boards and wondered why the hold sign closest to the runway was a different colour to the intermediate hold a few metres away. AM explained that where the hold was a runway holding point the runway designator took on the red and white hold colours but in the case of an intermediate hold without any runway designator, the holding point identifier took the red and white colours. CAP168 section 7 documents this. There is currently no GNSS equivalent of the 'CAT I' suffix to a runway identifier and the CAA had been consulted on the correct way to identify these holds.

AM added that consideration had been given to simply moving the existing holds back as there was not a great distance between the holding points. However he felt the view from the earlier positions of the final approach was not as good and the use of additional holds was appropriate for safety reasons.

AC asked if the edges of a ramp outside his building could be painted to reduce the risk of people tripping over it. AM will have a look at this.

LR reported that a large puddle appeared in the car park in the middle of the pedestrian walkway in heavy rain. AM will arrange for this to be filled in.

11. Dates of Future Meetings

14 th January 2015	4.30pm
1 st April 2015	6pm
1 st July 2015	6pm
30 th September 2015	6pm