MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FENLAND AERO CLUB

Present: James Baldwyn, Claire Buckley, Carl Husain, Tim James, John Parker, Angelo Sapiano (delayed), Peter Watson, Martin Williams

Ex-Officio:

Others in Attendance: David Westall (RFFS)

THURSDAY, 27 AUGUST 2020
Video Conference Meeting Convened 7pm

1) APOLOGIES: Kerry Allen

2) PREVIOUS MINUTES (23 July 2020) were approved.

3) CHAIRMAN’S REPORT (Peter Watson):

The Chairman explained that flying instructors employed by the Fenland Flying School may be considered for Honorary Membership under Club Rule 2.2(e)(4). The Secretary read out the club rule to Committee. Mary Payne the club membership secretary informed the Chairman that Paul Brian now qualifies for this consideration.

Peter offered this for comment around the room. The Committee agreed this unanimously with immediate effect.

The Chairman said this Committee is now a new committee following the confirmation from the members in the recent poll 12 August 2020 (not being able to hold the AGM 2020 due to Covid19 restrictions and concerns).

Peter asked if anyone would like to undertake the role of Chairman or other positions.

However, it was decided to first consider whether this committee would replace the three vacancies increasing from the current 8 members to the maximum of 11 members. This was deferred to a separate item later in the meeting [See Section 14].

The Chairman reported on the building of one of two new hangars by John Wright between the E-plane and Nissan hangars giving increased capacity in anticipation of the club extending facilities at the airfield.
Peter raised the report submitted by the CFI Steve Brown concerning small but deep “trenches” on the runway.

Peter said these will be filled with sharp sand that coming Saturday. He went on to add that the fire crew and truck will be used to make good the problem. The flying school had been informed. He estimated the work would take about 90 minutes and will be in contact with the tower. A NOTAM was not needed.

Also in Steve Brown’s safety report [Annex A] was an “accusation” that this committee had some responsibility for the incident of an aircraft losing power on take-off from runway 08 a few weeks previous. Peter said the cause of the incident was known; he said the incident had nothing to do with our fuel testing during the lockdown period. Peter asked this be placed into the minutes.

4) TREASURER’S REPORT (Peter Watson):

The Treasurer reported that in the Savings Account we have deposited £74,999.00; in the Current Account there is £48,847.00. He explained that nearly £24,000 was transferred from the Current Account into the Savings Account. Charity Account has £338.00.

Peter went on to say that after we had issued the financial statement for the year to club members, some were saying there was a problem with the accounts – saying “they didn’t seem right”. Peter said he took this to mean we were cheating or we’re crooked. He said we are none of these things; it’s just that people did not read them correctly. Peter explained that a rent payment had been recorded as been made twice. The accountants he said had verified we had made a small profit in the last financial year of about £1,500.

Following a comment by a club member to the Secretary about paying too much in Bank charges, Peter said he would look into this.

Peter reported a meeting with our insurance broker. A copy of our insurance details had been circulated to all Committee. Areas where it was felt we were under-insured have been amended. Peter said our policy payment this year is in the region of £11,000.

A comment was made concerning previous years amounts. Peter said there wasn’t cover for two extra hangars. Also a comment was made that we do not require cover for Wings & Wheels this year. Peter acknowledged this, also saying that we now believe we have the correct cover required for any claims. However, we do have an option to raise the buildings insurance and if required to bring in a professional assessor.

As for insurance for the hangar being built, Peter said this is the responsibility of John Wright until it’s handed over to the Club.

5) SECRETARY’S REPORT (Claire Buckley):

The Secretary reported she had been contacted by a member of the public asking if they could spread the ashes of her deceased husband on the airfield.

The Secretary asked for comments.

The Committee gave its agreement.
The Secretary referred to her submitted annual report, saying it was self-explanatory. However she wished to inform Committee the number of emails sent during the poll ending 12 August 2020 were not 189 as she first stated, but 153. The first figure incorrectly added in the 36 unpaid/undecided members. She apologised to Committee and to members; it did not change the outcome just the statistics of the outcome showing a much better result as regards turnout than previously reported.

**The Committee had no issue with this.**

The Secretary reported that she had updated the Covid19 Risk Assessment for the Club House and Restaurant on Sunday 23 August 2020 making sure things we’re working as previously arranged. Julie confirmed the signing in book was up-to-date and that sanitisers were available on all tables as before. Julie reported no problems with the current arrangement.

Fenland Airfield Website: Kat Moir who was to undertake a redesign now felt she was unable to do this due to her company restructure. As a result the Secretary reported that she had contacted Mark Fitzsimmons who runs a design agency called Xigen. Mark had built the original website some years ago. A proposal had been drawn up for a similar budget as had been previously agreed.

**The Secretary said she would report back on this topic at next committee.**

6) **SAFETY REPORT** (Martin Williams):

Tim James formally proposed Martin Williams for the post of Safety Officer; Claire Buckley seconded the proposal. There were no objections. Martin Williams was appointed Safety Officer.

Martin confirmed he too looked around the Clubhouse and agreed with the Secretary that things were working smoothly.

Martin raised the issue of the Sand box at the fuelling point.

David Westall (RFFS) said he had this in hand.

*Angelo Sapiano entered the meeting (19:37hrs).*

The Secretary asked Martin to report on the safety matters sent by Steve Brown for the SMS.


1. A NOTAM was previously handled by the Aerobatic Academy. On this occasion it was not, as their usual administrator was in lockdown. This was not a formal competition with an attending public. A risk assessment was done on the Sunday. Ray Nicholson was happy to continue. The Committee agreed that Fenland Aero Club will in future not rely upon the Aerobatic Academy but to raise the NOTAM itself.

2. The CFI had been checking documents (Club Rule 7.10) and reports a reluctance by one un-named member to show them. Peter Watson has offered to view them. More discussion followed.

**It was agreed the Secretary would write to Steve about this.**

3. It was agreed that Peter had already addressed this matter in the Chairman’s Report earlier.
4. Carl Husain asked Steve when he first took up his role as fuel manager what he did with the waste fuel. He was told by Steve he ‘disposed’ of it, if not then the club would have to pay for it to be taken away.

Carl gave explanation of the fuel testing process adopted during the lockdown. He also said it was acceptable to return tested fuel to the tanks after filtering. The Daily Ops Manual (1.1(4)) states this is permissible; this was confirmed by the CAA inspectors at their visit in January this year.

He further explained that after the end of COVID19 lockdown he marked cans specifically, in fact he asked Steve if he also put tested fuel in 100LL and UL91 marked cans separately. Carl said that Steve confirmed this. Following this Carl said he specifically marked the cans with a paint marker clearly 100LL and UL91.

Carl said immediately after he did this both Steve and Paul said this could not possibly meet the standards required; they said they’ve tried it with special stainless steel vessels... they couldn’t meet the standards. Now Carl says, there is a label by the two cans saying the fuel is mixed... don’t put it back into the tanks.

Carl referred to Steve’s first sentence: “I am most concerned to hear that the Accountable Manager decided it was only necessary to test the fuel on a weekly basis, yet offer it for sale to pilots on a daily basis...” Carl said that Steve is most concerned, but still continues using the fuel nonetheless.

Carl recounted his conversation with the CAA inspectors who told him we can put tested fuel back into the tanks. Therefore, Carl said, if we take reasonable precautions, and filtered it; he didn’t think there is any reason why we should fear putting this fuel back into the tanks.

He said, conflating this with Carole and Jim’s incident is outrageous.

Discussion followed.

The Secretary added that there was an outstanding matter concerning the airfield signs which Tim James may wish to comment.

Tim James (previous Safety Officer) explained that police wished to prosecute hair coursers under airfield regulations and the Aviation and Maritime Security Act. The signs we have need updating if there is a possibility of there being a successful prosecution.

Tim said he asked Ray Nicholson if we could legal advice from the CAA on the correct format for the signs. We’ve been advised to approach our CAA inspector contacts through the accountable manager. Tim said he will follow this up with David Beale in the next few days.

7) FUEL MANAGER’S REPORT (Carl Husain):

Carl reported that during July we sold 10,700 litres of 100LL; and 2,750 litres of UL91. We also sold a little JetA1 fuel, about 1,015 litres he said.

A quick summary of the year: we have sold 56,455 litres of 100LL and 13,199 litres of UL91.

Fuel sold to non-members account 43% of the 100LL; members account for 23% of 100LL
The flying school, 35% of 100LL. Figures September 2019 to July 2020 as it’s only until recently Carl could get help from Jeff Helm on this granular analysis.

Of the UL91, 49% of sales was to non-members; 50% is members; 1% (60 litres) is the flying school. Carl added that overall this year surprisingly with the last (wet) winter and Covid19 we are only 27% behind from where we were in 2018-2019 for 100LL and only 20% for the sale of UL91. Not quite the disaster it might have been Carl said.

The Committee thanked Carl for his excellent work.

8) **HANGAR MANAGER’S REPORT** (John Parker):

John reported not much had happened since the last meeting. He confirmed Peter’s previous statement that John Wright is constructing additional hangar space between the E-Plane maintenance hangar and the Nissan hangar. John said we currently have full occupancy and another space should become free as Peter Watson has sold his Thatcher.

9) **AIRFIELD REPORT** (Peter Watson):

Peter reported that work is planned to address the runway surface issues reported by the CFI. Also the end board at “Whiskey” is in need of attention. He said he was hoping to get this repaired on Saturday. Also a runway light was damaged today when a motor glider ran over it and will be repaired as soon as possible.

Peter also reported on the intention to resurface part of 18/36 prior to the winter and a meeting with John (Parker) the Wrights, and “our friendly farmers” about the work. John had obtained a quote (£30,000). This was unaffordable. It was decided that the grass wouldn’t grow quickly enough during this time and to have it back operational in time. Therefore it was decided to get prepared now and do the works in the springtime. In the meantime Peter would get the auger to drill holes as needed (as we did before) over the period of the winter – probably starting in October. Although he said the field to the east of 18/36 had been drained by ploughing he still believed we would still get some spillage from that field. Therefore it is the intention to put in some extra drainage holes down that section.

This will be in a proposal to the Committee next month.

10) **EVENTS REPORT** (James Baldwyn):

James reported he had placed in Facebook notice of the fly-ins for this coming Monday to get one or two additional visitors. The tower is open and Julie (Runways) and RFFS will be there.

He said he had also arranged a gyrocopter fly-in for 27 September.

James said he’d review the other proposed fly-ins depending upon how Kerry is doing.

As to Wings & Wheel’s James said he was not comfortable with this considering there are all sorts of rules and regulations (due to Covid19) likely to apply. He spoke of taping off a section from the JetA1 refuelling to the end just for a vintage car display but not inviting the public.

James asked that the Chairman go around the room for opinion.
The Committee agreed due to the uncertainties of Covid19 that we could not run a Wings & Wheels event for this year.

11) IER/RFFS REPORT (David Westall):

David first wished to cover matters of training and issues concerning G/G radio. He reported a problem that those in possession of an A/G licence think they are exempt from training doing G/G. This is not the case he said. He went on to add that under CAT168 and in the Aerodrome Manual for regular training is the need for R/T procedures. It’s been a problem getting everyone together he said. If they don’t want to do regular training then they don’t want to do IER. As the onsite safety team at the weekends we need to be on top of this David said.

David also mentioned the need for the correct documentation of our training. He said we will be doing regular training of hot fire, first aid, rescues out of aircraft and timed turnout which has been done really well in less than three minutes. He said these training modules are being put in place and we will get everyone together over the weekends every other month.

David reported that due to Covid19 we cannot do mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and he recommends that we purchase AmbuBags (pump bags).

Also more local people are showing interest. He said we have three new crew members, Steve, Dan and Gaz; he will pass on their details to the Secretary (as Volunteer Members).

Gaz Roberts one of the new members, is currently a RAF fire instructor. He is keen to do as much of our training as possible.

Everyone now has fire kit that fits them.

He reported that the fire truck exhaust is “hanging off” and the radio is still “tripping” (of frequency), although it has been requested that Dave Almay deals with this.

**David said that we will be going to frequency 121.600 MHz if we have any incidents; this has been agreed with Ray in the tower.**

The Committee thanked David for his expertise and effort in this role.

At this time, the Chairman wished to bring up a matter concerning the emergency HeliMed helicopter the previous weekend. James Baldwyn gave explanation.

James was on fire duty the previous Sunday at about 4.30pm when a call was received by the airfield that HeliMed wanted to pick up a patient from a land ambulance who had a heart problem in one of the local villages.

The arrangement was to get the helicopter to land at Hold Echo near to the gate. The helicopter landed and the land ambulance arrived. After about 45 minutes the medics stabilised the patient and did a rotors-running transfer with the fire truck standing by. It was agreed that this went off without a hitch and people felt good about this.

James reported that in filling up the second tank of G-GL the student climbed on-board the aircraft, strapped in and was ready to go, so there was a period of time there was a person on board the aircraft while it was being fuelled in violation of airfield regulations and safety measures referred to
in the Aerodrome Manual Section 7.14(d) in accordance with CAA CAP748 [as currently documented].

The Chairman wished the Secretary to minute this.

Discussion followed.

James was advised that a Safety Report should be submitted.

12) FENLAND FLYING SCHOOL (Submitted See ANNEX A below):
The Committee had addressed the submitted Safety Report in Section (6) Safety Report and Section (9) Runways Report.

13) RUNWAYS RESTAURANT (Kerry Allan not present):
The Chairman reported that Runways Restaurant was performing well at the weekends. Julie is managing matters extremely well and coming during the week putting out sandwiches. The Committee thanked her for this effort.

14) THE COMMITTEE 2020-2021 (Peter Watson):
The Chairman reported that an electronic poll of Club members was conducted [verified by Mary Payne the membership secretary, members gave this Committee a mandate to carry on to manage the affairs of the club until the next AGM in July 2021; this as a result of the Covid19 restrictions and uncertainties. 67 members agreed; 21 members disagreed. The Club President congratulated this Committee in gaining the confidence of the members].

Peter wished to know if everyone on this Committee is happy to stay on. He also stated that Neale Buck had resigned citing ‘outside influences’.

The question posed, did Committee wish to invite other members onto Committee replacing those who had left over the last year (three in total).

The Chairman invited the Secretary to give comment concerning the numbers of Committee members required.

The Secretary quoted Club Rule 5.3, that the committee is made up of “…an adequate number of members to form a Committee of not less than five (5) and not more than eleven (11).”

Following Paul Brian having been asked to step down in April, and the resignation of Robin Hoile and now Neale Buck, there remain eight (8) members on this Committee, leaving a possible three (3) vacancies.

The Chairman asked for comments around the room on the question; should this Committee bring other people in by whatever means onto this Committee?

David Westall left the meeting. Committee thanked David for his attendance and contribution.

Discussion followed.

Some members were of the opinion others should be invited, although did accept its implementation might be “messy”. Some members also felt that they could not manage this to the
complete satisfaction of some – between a rock and a hard place, whatever is done to seemingly resolve this there would still be disagreement. It was commented that Committee has a good management focus on where this airfield is going for the first time in a long while, and that the focus should be retained.

Also stated was that the question put to the members in the poll was not ambiguous, it was very clear and specific; club members gave this Committee in its current form a mandate to continue.

By 5 to 3, the Committee voted not to fill the vacancies; the Committee remains unchanged.

The Committee expressed their thanks to Neil Buck and to Robin Hoile for their time and their work in Committee on behalf of Fenland Aero Club members.

15) FLYING SCHOOLS, ADDITIONAL SCHOOLS (Peter Watson):

The Chairman asked the Committee if it wished to invite other flight training schools to Fenland in addition to the one already expressing an interest; and did we want to advertise this?

One member felt to advertise may jeopardise the current expression of interest; and believed it was important we ask Steve Brown to also express his interest as mentioned in the Committee’s letter of response to the members [02 July 2020].

Others were happy for additional flying schools to come to Fenland as soon as possible. Also mentioned was that if the current flying school should seek to “screw up” this business opportunity for Fenland Airfield then that would bring with it a completely different scenario. Spoken also was the issue of affordability paying £178 per hour for a Cessna plus an additional £60 a month, then the best way to sort this out would be to have some competition as soon as possible and to get more young people flying in a more affordable way.

The Committee agreed to carry on conducting negotiations straight away for Microlight and with the current interested party. The Secretary would write to the Fenland Flying School asking to submit their plans for the next five (5) years. At next Committee details of the negotiations of the interested party would be given. An additional point made was that any discussion with the flying school should not stop negotiations with others coming to Fenland.

16) PURCHASE OF AN AIRCRAFT FOR THE AERO CLUB

Peter Watson asked the opinion of the Committee concerning the Aero Club purchasing (in principle) a small aircraft that Fenland Aero Club members could rent – a two seat permit aircraft in order to keep costs down.

Does the Committee agree or disagree?

Peter asked for comments around the room.

The majority of opinion was that this in principle was a good idea. However, it might be a question asked too early as the interested party may give other options. Also there was concern of the capital amount when other things on the airfield would benefit from some cash (toilets). But for some, this could be a good solution. It was agreed the topic would be revisited.
17) AOB

a) Carl Husain reported troubles with the internet router saying a replacement would be about £250 appropriate to the task. Discussion followed. Carl said he would do some more investigating and come back with a proposal.

b) James Baldwyn proposed that we register our location as having a defibrilator to be available to the public and our first aiders if needed. The Committee thought this a good idea.

c) Claire Buckley said she had sent committee members copies of the draft minutes from the 2019 AGM. Could these be approved and/or put to the club members for their approval.

There were no objections.

The minutes of the 2019 AGM were approved by Committee and the Secretary would circulate them to Club members for their approval.

There was no other business. The Chairman closed the meeting at 21.35hrs.

Signed .................................................................  Date ........ 24-09-2020

FAC Chairman
ANNEX A       FENLAND FLYING SCHOOL SAFETY REPORT COMMITTEE 27 AUGUST 2020

Safety Issues

1. The committee has made it clear that the Accountable Manager is responsible for the issuing of NOTAMS. It was therefore surprising that no NOTAM was issued to cover the aerobatic event of the weekend of 25th/26th July that was organized by the Aero Club. For safety’s sake, it may be prudent, for the Accountable Manager to issue a NOTAM for any future similar events.

2. As you know, as CFI, I have been checking the documents of members, in accordance with rule 10, in order to ensure our members are flying legally and consequently covered by insurance. Most members have been very cooperative and understanding of the need to have their licences checked. However, there is one member that has, despite numerous requests to do so, failed to produce his documentation. As a Flight Examiner and proprietor of the flying school, I have had sight or knowledge of most members’ licences at some time or another. But I have no idea, at all, if this particular member even HAS a licence and as he is obviously very reluctant to give me sight of it, there seems to be a strong possibility that he could be operating out of Fenland without the necessary documentation.

Whilst the rules make provision for me to ask members for sight of their licence, there is no provision for any follow-up action for when a member refuses to comply. It is therefore up to the committee as to what, if anything, you want to do about this.

Should you decide matters need to be taken further, I shall be happy to provide the details of the member in question.

3. Regarding the airfield, there are a couple of issues that need addressing:
   a) The trenches that were dug across the runways are now significantly lower than their surroundings and are posing a danger to aircraft. Also, there are several other deep depressions that need addressing.
   b) The runway markings on 08/26 are almost invisible, as are the 08 runway numbers.

4. I am most concerned to hear that the Accountable Manager decided it was only necessary to test the fuel on a weekly basis, yet offer it for sale to pilots on a daily basis, during lockdown and whilst the Flying School was closed. The regulations clearly state the fuel must be tested daily, if being offered for sale on a daily basis. This coupled with the fact that waste fuel has been returned to the tanks, is most concerning. In theory, waste fuel CAN be returned to the tanks, but only if very strict procedures are adhered to in order to be assured of its quality. Those procedures are not followed at Fenland and consequently, the waste fuel should not have been returned to the tanks. Needless to say, yet again, the CFI was not consulted. Yet again, an instance of the Accountable Manager disregarding the regulations.

Obviously, it could have been sheer coincidence that Carol and Jim’s engine failure occurred immediately following being refuelled at Fenland during the ‘lockdown’ period.

Steve Brown CFI