MINUTES

Present: Councillors:

Officers:

Apologies: Councillors:

36. WELCOME - 5 MINS

The Chairman welcomed Members of the Committee and representatives from the Airport Company. All those in attendance were invited to introduce themselves to the meeting.

37. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING - 5 MINS

The minutes of the meeting of the Airport Consultative Committee, held on 18 May 2016, were submitted.

RESOLVED
That the Minutes be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:
Item 4 – COO’s Review/Activities Report should be amended to include the following:
Members noted the launch of new routes from Beijing Capital Airlines that were due to commence on 19th July. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) confirmed these weren’t now going ahead, however they emphasised they would continue to target new and emerging markets.
The attendance for Shard End Communities should be recorded as Mrs M Ball.
The attendance for Hodge Hill Housing Liaison Board should be recorded as Ms Tarpey

The following topics were raised under Matters Arising

Airbus 380 operations – it was noted by Members at the last ACC meeting that noise levels from these flights were quieter than anticipated. The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) confirmed the noise levels recorded for these flights, explaining that, on average, it was 78 dB on arrival. Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr D Ellis) emphasised this was to be welcomed, especially due to the much larger size of the aircraft and greater volume of passengers.

Portable Noise Monitor – at the previous meeting it was highlighted that Barston Parish Council had requested for a portable noise monitor to be deployed in Barston during July/August this year. The Airport Company (Tom
Redfern) confirmed the monitor had been installed in Barston on 15th August, at the same property used for the Airspace Change Process. It was also noted the Airport Company intended to procure a second portable noise monitor.

Barston Parish Council (Cllr R Lyon) expressed concern that the Airport Company only had one portable noise monitor, especially as this did not allow like for like comparisons. She also queried for how long the noise monitoring would be undertaken and what would be recorded. The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) emphasised the purpose of the trial in Barston was not to make like for like comparisons with other areas. It was also explained it was intended for the noise monitoring to be undertaken for two weeks, which could be extended, depending upon the runways used. It was confirmed the Airport Company would monitor data for all aircraft types and all the data recorded throughout the trial would be shared.

The Consumers Association (Mr P Orton) queried why the noise monitoring was being undertaken. He emphasised that, following the Airspace Change Process, the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) had made its ruling and questioned the basis for deploying the noise monitoring equipment again. He also expressed concern that the process could be costly and this may be passed on to the consumer. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) responded, stressing no cost would be passed on to the customer. It was also emphasised the Airport Company took its environmental responsibilities and relations with the local community extremely seriously. He detailed how the Airport Company wished to procure another set of noise monitoring equipment, to allow like for like comparisons in future, where appropriate. It was emphasised that the decisions where and when to deploy the noise monitoring equipment was ultimately undertaken by the Airport Company.

**Sound Installation Scheme** – at the previous meeting, Marston Green Residents Association (Mr J Fox) highlighted the existing scheme and queried whether it could be reviewed, so further residents would be eligible to have their properties upgraded. The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) explained the existing scheme went beyond Government guidelines. It was explained how eligibility for the scheme was based upon noise contours recorded in 2002. It was emphasised the noise impact since then had reduced; however the Airport Company still adhered to the levels recorded in 2002. The Airport Company also detailed how, if there was any surplus at the end of the installation scheme, they could consider upgrading further properties.

Barston Parish Council (Cllr R Lyon) queried whether there was any potential to review eligibility for the installation scheme, so it could be based upon specific communities such as Barston, rather than noise contours. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) explained how qualification for the scheme was based upon 63 dB noise levels, as per Government guidance – it was noted that, if noise levels exceeded this in Barston, residents there would be eligible. It was also confirmed the Airport Company reviewed the scheme every 2 years and, if the noise contours expanded, the scheme expanded. The Airport Company (David Winstanely) also emphasised their intention was to continue to follow, and exceed, existing Government guidance, rather than adopt a community-specific approach.
Marston Green Residents Association (Mr J Fox) emphasised he queried the existing scheme because residents impacted by engine ground running weren’t eligible to have their properties upgraded. He expressed concern he wasn’t having his query addressed. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) explained the Government guidance concerned aircraft in flight, rather than ground noise. She also emphasised that no Airport Company in the UK had an installation scheme for ground noise and noted there was no agreed methodology to measure the impact and determine eligibility for any support. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) explained they recognised Mr Fox’s concerns and confirmed they would respond to the issues he raised.

Members Feedback
Consumers Association (Mr P Orton) agreed to inform the ACC how he liaised with his organisation and highlighted key issues identified at the Committee. He explained how the organisations’ focus was representing the rights of the consumer and they also had a magazine – Which. It was also noted that most UK Airport Companies had a Consumers Association representative. Mr Orton provided examples of the issues the Consumers Association raised, which included the following:

- There were concerns at the high rates customers were being charged for calling certain Airport Companies, via 0870 and 0845 numbers, even though the regulatory body PhonepayPlus recommended against this. This matter was flagged up by a number of organisations, including the Consumers Association, and rectified.
- Customer Complaint Statistics – the Consumers Association monitored this, through Airports’ Customer Relationship Management systems.
- Flight delays – the Consumers Association has also monitored this and considered the compensation offered.
- Airport Passenger Duty – it was noted the UK had one of the highest duty rates in Europe and the Consumers Association was lobbying for this to be reduced.
- E-gates – the Consumers Association had looked at how these had been introduced and used and also monitored their effects upon queue times.

38. COO'S REVIEW/ACTIVITIES REPORT - 25 MINS

The Airport Company (David Winstanley) presented the Airport Activities report for the period April to June 2016. Several elements from the report were then highlighted to the Committee on the following topics:

- Aircraft & Passenger Statistics
- Aviation Development
- Marketing
- Commercial Development
- Operations
- Planning, Development and Transportation
Discussion points:

Catherine de Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) noted the volume of work the Marketing team undertook to engage local travel agents and raise awareness of routes – he queried how the Airport Company monitored the success of this. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) detailed how they received booking data from the travel agents and they were able to share this information with the Marketing team. It was noted this information enabled the Airport Company to monitor the levels of demand from different areas. Mr Cuthbert queried whether it was possible to assess how well individual travel agents were performing. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) confirmed they would liaise with the Marketing team and confirm this.

Consumers Association (Mr P Orton) highlighted that a lot of the Airport Company’s flights went to popular hubs, such as Paris and Frankfurt. He queried whether the Company monitored the onward flights customers were using, in order to identify potential new routes for Birmingham. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) confirmed they did get end route data and this was used when they looked to establish routes to new destinations, such as Australia and China.

Consumers Association (Mr P Orton) noted there were instances where the Airport Company had started new routes, which ran for a number of months and were popular, but were stopped. He queried why this had happened, particularly in regards to destinations in Europe. It was also questioned why Airline operators did not always look to increase the frequency of popular routes as well. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) explained the stopping of routes related to airframe utilisation, where operators decided to stop routes and shift to locations elsewhere that may be more economical. It was emphasised the Airport Company would always look to work with Airline operators to ensure the long-term success of routes. In regards to the frequency of routes, it was noted Airline operators might keep these low, in order to help ensure demand high.

Warwick District Council (Cllr G Illingworth) highlighted a poster the Airport Company had produced, illustrating a second runway and queried the feasibility of the location identified. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) explained the poster had been put into the public domain, as part of the Davies Report regarding expanding aviation capacity within the UK. He emphasised such material was produced to encourage a less London/South East-centric approach. It was also noted such illustrations were produced, to demonstrate how any Birmingham airport expansion could link up with other developments, such as HS2. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) also stressed such material was produced to illustrate a concept, rather than act as a formal proposal.

Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council queried the timescales for the publication of the new version of the Birmingham Airport Master Plan. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) explained the publication of the Master Plan had been delayed to allow consideration of the outcomes of the Davies Report, and they were confident it would be produced by May 2017. It was noted the Airport
Company was working to ensure the publication of their Master Plan linked up with the Plans of the other significant businesses and organisations across the Borough, including Jaguar Land Rover, the NEC, Resorts Word and UK Central.

RESOLVED
(i) That the contents of the Airport Activities report for the period April to June 2016 be noted.

39. SUSTAINABILITY REPORT - 10 MINS

The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) presented the Sustainability Report for the period April to June 2016. The contents of the report, on the following topics, were taken as read:

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

Discussion points:
In presenting the report, the Airport Company (Tom Redfern) highlighted table 6.4, which recorded trends in Wake Vortex Strikes. It was explained the Airport Company themselves were identifying where such strikes were happening and were informing the home owners concerned and undertaking the necessary works.

RESOLVED
That the contents of the report be noted.

40. PASSENGER SERVICES REPORT/PRESENTATION - 15 MINS

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) initially presented the report, where he detailed how they had launched their new Customer Relationship Management System, called Oracle RightNow, in March 2016. It was explained that, when customers made complaints, queries or compliments via the website, they were taken to the RightNow portal and the information collated was used to allow learning and enable the Airport Company to build a knowledge base. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) explained the information was presented via the four following sets of data:

- Answers viewed per month
- Top ten answers clicked on and viewed
- Complaints, compliments and feedback
Top ten complaints by type

Discussion points:

Berkswell Parish Council (Cllr R Lloyd) highlighted the complaints that don’t necessarily form part of the top ten responses – he queried whether complaints were also monitored for severity. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) confirmed they did collate further data and assessed all complaints submitted – it was noted they had identified a cut-off point to allow the Committee to conduct a reasonable analysis.

The Knowle Society (Mrs L Baker) queried whether there was any way the Committee could monitor and analyse the compliments submitted. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) confirmed this information was recorded and explained they could look to share it by identifying the key areas the compliments related to. It was also noted that, for all compliments recorded, they were reported back to the relevant service area.

The Airport Company (Deane Arnold) also addressed the Committee and raised a number of points regarding Passenger Services activity, including the following:

- Queue measurements systems were being trialled, which allowed the Airport Company to monitor the movements of passengers
- E-gates were now in operation
- MITIE, an infrastructure consultancy company, was conducting surveys in the most utilised toilet blocks.
- Interactive children’s areas, called Skyzone’s, had been relaunched for 2016.
- Self Service check-in machines – the provision of this was out to tender, and the Airport Company was looking to shortlist potential companies to undertake this work. It was noted that, once the machines were introduced, Assistants would also be on hand to help.

The Airport Company (Deane Arnold) also detailed the operational performance statistics they monitored, which included Handling Agent performance, cleaning audit scores and security queue time performance.

Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr D Ellis) highlighted the E-gates and queried whether there would be any audio instructions for visually impaired passengers. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) explained how they were working with other Partners, including the UK Border Force, to support visually impaired passengers. It was also noted the Airport Company was looking to introduce facilities similar to an I-pad, whereby the text could be expanded.

Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council (Cllr D Sandells) queried whether any explanatory information could be displayed in the run-up to the E-gates so passengers were prepared and knew what to expect. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) confirmed they could look into this.
Consumers Association (Mr P Orton) highlighted the volume of complaints submitted for missed flights and queried the reasons for this. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) explained how some Airline Companies delayed their flights if they were aware passengers had checked in. It was noted other Airport Companies would not vary their flights if passengers had failed to reach the departure gates. It was also emphasised that the volume of missed flights was extremely low, when considered against the volume of flights overall during a 3 month period.

RESOLVED
That the contents of the report be noted.

41. MATTER ARISING FROM MEMBERS PRE-SUBMITTED QUESTIONS - 10 MINS

Catherine de Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) – submitted the following questions (detailed in italic):

a) para 2 in the Engine Ground Running section. The trials don’t end now until Dec 2016 but the Airport Company are reviewing the results ..........in September 2016 . The trials will not have ended?

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) explained that a review would be conducted of the evidence collated so far as part of the EGR trial. It was explained the trial ended in December 2016, therefore an agreement needed to be sought prior to then.

b) 5.2 Track Keeping Performance : will raising the ceiling from 3000ft to 4000ft have any influence on the gathering /quality of this data or warrant a review of the graph.

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) confirm that raising the ceiling for track keeping performance should not impact upon the quality of the data recorded.

c) Operational Performance 3.1 and 3.2 could the category descriptions be explained

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) explained the categories recorded for airline operational performance, which included total movements overall, departure punctuality, gate open punctuality and arrival punctuality.

d) 3.2 Airline handling agents data seem to be missing for some airlines

The Airport Company (Deane Arnold) detailed how some airlines only ran a small number of flights, which mean they didn’t use the same handling agents – as a consequence, this data couldn’t be recorded in this table.

e) 6 Security Queue times : do times vary much during different hours of the day ? Is this data available

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) confirmed the security queue times did vary during different hours of the day. The Airport Company (Deane Arnold) also confirmed this information was recorded and an update could be provided for the next set of quarterly results.
RESOLVED
That the responses to the pre-submitted questions be noted.

42. UPDATE ON AIRSPACE CHANGE PROCESS - 10 MINS

The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) conducted a presentation, updating on the Airspace Change Process and the following issues were highlighted:

- On 22nd April 2016, the Airport Company, with Barston Parish Council and Balsall Parish Council, met with the CAA to discuss trial methodology.
- Trial methodology was discussed in broad terms, but no resolution was found.
- On 13th May 2016, the CAA sent the Airport Company draft outline methodology.
- After 13th May, the Airport Company discussed internally how it may achieve the methodology for the trial.
- On 17th May, the Airport Company raised its concerns with the CAA regarding trial methodology.
- On 1st July the Airport Company wrote to the CAA highlighting its concerns and asking for the CAA to reconsider its decision.
- On 5th August, the CAA published the letter to Birmingham Airport Company on its website for comment by 9th September.
- The Airport Company had looked to invite Ward Councillors from the affected areas to make nominations to an Airspace Change Focus Group, in order to provide the Company with initial views.

Discussion points:

Fordbridge Town Council (Cllr L Sorrell) queried which areas had been invited to sit on the Airspace Change Focus Group. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) explained how they had looked to invite Ward Councillors impacted by the proposed flight paths. It was emphasised that, if there were any changes to the design and flight path proposals, the Airport Company would look to invite any further representatives affected.

RESOLVED
That the update on the Airspace Change Process be noted.

43. NOISE ABATEMENT DEPARTURE PROFILES - 20 MINS

It was agreed for this item to be deferred to a future meeting.

44. CARBON MANAGEMENT - 10 MINS

The Airport Company (Richard Hardeman) conducted a presentation, detailing the Company’s Carbon Management Plan and the points raised included the following:
It was a requirement of the s106 Agreement to agree the Carbon Management Plan with Solihull Council and for this to be reviewed every 3 years.

The Plan required the Airport Company to identify appropriate, proportionate and reasonable initiatives to off-set the increase in carbon emissions from Airport Activities.

Through the Plan, the Airport Company agreed in 2013 to a target based upon CO2 per passenger to reduce by 4% by 2015/16.

Overall, the total gross emissions had been reduced by 9.7%, whilst the emissions per passenger had been reduced by 26%.

Carbon Management Plan achievements included investing in smart meter technology, the review of energy efficient investment, as well as working with Sustainable Aviation.

Discussion points:

Catherine de Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) noted the Carbon Management Plan proposals were initially reported to Solihull Council’s Airport Working Party and he queried its role. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) explained the role of the Working Party was to consider the initial proposals and make recommendations to the Planning Committee. Further details regarding the Airport Working Party can be viewed via the following link http://eservices.solihull.gov.uk/mgInternet/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=327

Shard End Communities (Mrs M Ball) highlighted the volume of businesses that operated at the Airport site and queried how their carbon emissions were managed. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) detailed how they worked with Solihull Council and other local organisations, via the Solihull Sustainability Visioning Group, to support sustainable development and high environmental standards within the Borough. It was also explained how the Airport Company also looked to engage businesses at the site internally and many of them had energy management plans in place. The Committee was also informed that World Duty Free had recently received an award, at the Green Apple Awards, for environmental best practise.

Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council (Cllr D Sandells) queried whether there was any potential for the Airport Company to look to attain the ISO5000 Energy Management standard. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) explained how they were at an early stage of renewing their Carbon Management Plan, however it was emphasised this was something they could potentially look at in future.

Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council (Cllr D Sandells) also queried whether the Airport Company invested in solar panel technology. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) confirmed that they did and detailed how, as part of their future planning, they were looking at further investment potential in this technology. It was also questioned whether electric car charging stations were provided at the Airport. The Airport Company (Richard …) confirmed charging stations were provided and explained how charges had recently been introduced for this, following the withdrawal of Government subsidies.
RESOLVED
That the Carbon Management Plan update be noted.

45. NIGHT FLYING POLICY REVIEW - 20 MINS

The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) conducted a presentation, detailing the Airport Company’s Night Flying Policy Review and the points raised included the following:

- Night Flying was a sensitive community issue, as well as a national issue. Airports have varying policies.
- The Airport Company’s Night Flying Policy was subject to review every 3 years.
- The Night Flying Policy at Birmingham was one of the most stringent in the UK. Main policy restrictions included an annual ATM limit of 5%, as well as a night noise violation limit of 85dB(A) departure only.
- The s106 Agreement required, following the opening of the Runway Extension, a phased reduction of the Annual Limit to 4% or lower on a programme to be agreed with the Council.
- The volume of night noise limit violations, as well as the volume of night noise complaints, were reducing year on year.
- The Airport Company’s Night Flying Policy Proposal included the following:
  - To maintain all aspects of the Night Flying Policy
  - To trial a 4.5% ATM to commence from year 2016/17 to assess its impact and review as part of the 3 year cycle.
  - To continue to review the night flying policy every 3 years, in accordance with the requirements of the Section 106 Agreement.

Discussion points:

Balsall Parish Council (Cllr M Tattum) noted the Section 106 Agreement required the reduction of the Annual Limit to 4% and queried the timescales for this. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) explained there was no specific limit and the timescales were to be agreed in consultation with Solihull Council, upon a phased basis.

Berkswell Parish Council (Berkswell Parish Council) highlighted that the volume of night time noise complaints were considerably higher than the amount of actual night noise violations, which reflected the extent to which this issue related to perception.

Catherine de Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) noted the proposal to trial a reduction of the Annual Limit to 4.5% from year 2016/17; however he queried whether it was correct that the Airport Company was only operating at 60% of its agreed night time capacity. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) confirmed this was correct and explained how they had operated at a reduced night time capacity, due to ongoing maintenance works. Mr D Cuthbert queried
whether there was any potential for the Airport Company to be more stringent in its efforts to reduce the Annual Limit to 4%. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) explained how they had proposed for a trial reduction of the Annual Limit to 4.5%, to assess the impact and ensure this was sustainable and commercially viable. The Airport Company noted the Section 106 Agreement stipulated for them to introduce a reduction of the Annual Limit to 4%, upon a phased basis, and it was emphasised they were doing this.

Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council (Cllr D Sandells) highlighted that the Section 106 Agreement was to eventually reduce the Annual Limit to 4% and it was still at 5%. He expressed concern that it appeared the Airport Company hadn’t made any progress. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) explained the Night Flying Policy was subject to a 3 year review and this was the first opportunity to assess it.

The Knowle Society (Mrs L Baker) queried what information was recorded as part of the Night Flying Policy and noted that, previously, noise levels may have been impacted by incoming flights with armed forces. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) explained only commercial flights were recorded as part of the Night Flying Policy.

Barston Parish Council (Cllr R Lyon) queried whether there was any potential to reduce the night noise violation limit below 85dB, particularly following the recent introduction of quieter aircrafts. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) emphasised their night noise violation limit was lower than many other Airports, who still adhered to 87dB. It was explained that, if they looked to reduce this limit any further, it would impact upon the commercial viability of the Airport.

RESOLVED
That the Night Flying Policy Review update be noted.

46. ENGINE GROUND RUNNING STUDY - 20 MINS

The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) conducted a presentation, explaining the Engine Ground Running Trial the Airport Company was undertaking and the points raised included the following:

- The existing Airport Operating Instruction (AOI) permits Taxiway Echo and Taxiway Lima for Engine Ground Running (EGR).
- A feasibility study demonstrated the current arrangements were not in line with EGR operational requirements.
- An EGR trial in additional locations was agreed with Solihull Council, which was due to end in December 2016 – therefore an agreement needed to be established before then.
- The Committee was informed of the trial results for the locations Taxiway Echo, Foxtrot, Juliet and Tango. The information recorded included the total number of complaints, as well as the average complaints per run.
- The Committee was also informed that the Airport would seek approval from Solihull Council to amend the AOI for specific Engine Ground Running locations, until the Master Plan process confirmed the solution for EGR.
Discussion points:

Marston Green Residents Association (Mr J Fox) emphasised it was important not to underestimate the concerns raised from Marston Green. He also explained he recognised the stringent restrictions being introduced for Taxiway Tango. Mr Fox emphasised that, despite the distance, there must be reasons why the noise travelled to the Marston Green area and this needed to be considered as part of the EGR Review process. The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) confirmed they would assess these factors as part of the Review and explained it was recognised that the noise travelled due to environmental conditions, especially when it was calm and quiet. The Airport Company (Kirstin Kane) emphasised that, as part of the Master Plan process, they were looking to identify an optimal solution for EGR.

RESOLVED
That the update on the Engine Ground Running Study be noted.

47. COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT - 20 MINS

It was agreed for this item to be deferred to a future meeting.

48. CHADWICK END PARISH COUNCIL - APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION TO ACC - 5 MINS

The Passenger Representative (Vice-Chairman) (Mrs R Tyler) detailed how an application for membership of the ACC from Chadwick End Parish Council had been considered by the ACC Steering Group on 27th July. It was explained how the application was considered in light of the previous review of membership of the ACC, following the airspace change process, where it had been identified that greater representation of areas to the North of the Airport was required. Mrs Tyler also detailed how the Steering Group had recommended for a new approach to be trialled for 12 months, whereby Mrs L Baker, of the Knowle Society would act as a link with the Parish Council, to allow the sharing and discussion of relevant information.

Discussion points:

Berkswell Parish Council (Cllr R Lloyd) queried whether there was any potential to include Chadwick End on the distribution list for agendas, minutes and other relevant information, in order to help transparency. The Committee agreed to this.

Barston Parish Council (Cllr R Lyon) highlighted that Chadwick End was in a holding area and was significantly impacted by the Airport. She also emphasised that she believed that Chadwick End had different views from Balsall Parish Council, an area they previously came under. Cllr Lyon also...
questioned the basis for the existing membership of the ACC and noted some areas already had two representatives.

Passenger Representative (Vice-Chairman) (Mrs R Tyler) explained that, moving forward, it was necessary to review the existing membership of the committee and she expressed concern at the present volume of members, especially when compared to other ACC’s. Mrs Tyler highlighted that the next Annual General meeting offered an opportunity to initiate the review of existing membership again, to ensure effective representation, especially to the North of the Airport.

RESOLVED
The ACC approved the following recommendations:
(i) To not support the request from Chadwick End Parish Council to be represented at the Committee.
(ii) To support the Steering Group’s recommendation for Mrs L Baker to act as a link with the Parish Council and for these arrangements to be reviewed after a 12 month period.

49. MEMBERS INFORMATION PACK - 5 MINS

Mrs L Baker, of the Knowle Society, detailed how she had produced a proposed information pack for Members, which was intended to support all members, especially those relatively new to the Committee, through providing ready access to support and advice. It was explained the information pack could include relevant background information, such as the Members list, as well as a list of the Committee Officers and Airport Company Representatives and their roles. Mrs Baker also suggested the introduction of mentoring, where those members who had served on the Committee for a significant period could share their experience and advice with newer members. It was suggested that, if anyone wished to act as a mentor, or would like to receive support from one, they could contact the secretary – jbright@solihull.gov.uk. During discussions it was suggested for the information pack to also include the ACC’s Constitution and Terms of Reference.

RESOLVED
The ACC agreed to receive an information pack at the next meeting on 16th November 2016.

Time Not Specified