

Letters to the Editor

Airfields in peril

Sir,
I am a chartered town planning consultant specialising in airport and aerodrome work. Over the past 20 years I have advised on over 160 different flying sites in the UK with some notable successes.

I am currently advising a number of smaller airports and aerodromes, four of which need the help which only pilots and other aviation enthusiasts can give. Could I therefore prevail upon your readers to write to me if they can help with knowledge of the following airfields in the period from 1999 to date.

1. **Bailey's Farm Airfield**, Long Crendon, Bucks – the home of Zulu Glasstek – sailplane repairers and suppliers of the delightful Silence Twister.



2. **Ledbury (Preston Cross)** airfield, Forest of Dean, Glos – aka Velcourt.

3. **Rougham Airfield**, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk – the site of regular airshows and exhibitions.
If a pilot has flown to or from the above sites in the period from 1999 to date, please could they send me a copy of their log book entry recording the flight, and also their name and address.

The other site, Damyns Hall Aerodrome near Uppingham in Essex, is facing a series of enforcement notices currently being issued by

the London Borough of Havering. The aerodrome is located close to the City of London, it has licensed status, aviation fuel and an excellent café, and it deserves to be recognised for the important contribution it makes to the local community. Supporters of the aerodrome should write to me setting out their own reasons why it should be safeguarded. I will make sure that the inspector, who is to determine the appeals, has sight of the support letters.

Thank you all in advance for your help.

Peter Kember
Aviation Planning Consultant
Kember Loudon Williams Ltd
Ridgers Barn, Bunny Lane
ErIDGE, Tunbridge Wells
Kent TN6 9HA
2pk@peterkember.co.uk
01892 750018

CAA insurance claim

Sir,
I would like to take this opportunity to correct your coverage of the mandatory insurance requirements for aircraft owners and operators (*Insurance falls into bureaucrats' playpen – General Aviation, December 2008*) and also to clarify the CAA's policy on compliance monitoring of this EC Regulation.

The Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) Aircraft Registration Section has not written to aircraft owners to check their insurance as a result of the financial downturn and at no stage has the CAA asked for proof that an aircraft is not in use or demanded that aircraft be grounded due to currency fluctuations.

The CAA is tasked by the Government with administering EC Regulation 785/2004 on insurance requirements for air carriers and aircraft operators. As part of this work a standard letter is periodically sent to registered owners to ensure that they are aware of the requirements and asking them to demonstrate compliance with the regulation by supplying a copy of their certificate of insurance.

If an aircraft is not in use for any reason, for example an aircraft undergoing restoration or still under construction and therefore not insured, then we ask the registered owner to confirm that to us and undertake to supply a copy of the insurance before the aircraft next flies.

The CAA will normally consider evidence of insurance, and therefore compliance with the

Regulation, on the basis of the exchange rate between Sterling and the Special Drawing Right (SDR) in place at the inception of the policy. However, owners and operators need to be aware that it is their responsibility to ensure that adequate cover exists for each and every flight.

If owners or operators have concerns over their level of cover they should contact their broker for advice.

Robert Ferris
Head of Aircraft Registration
Civil Aviation Authority

Fined £120

Sir,
I heard on the news yesterday that the Stansted protestors 'Plane Stupid' had their day in court and were fined up to £120 each and were given some Community Service to do, assuming they actually are made to turn up. I think I am right in saying 57 commercial flights were affected.

I am trying to equate this deliberate act designed to cause a commercial pilot problems and the consequential financial loss to all those involved and the level of fine and punishment to the individuals, with the grief and stress given to a PPL by the authorities for a careless, minor, inadvertent, error of judgement leading to an infringement causing the diversion a commercial aircraft or two off course. One certain and fundamental difference, regardless of how wrong it is to do it, PPLs don't make that mistake deliberately.

Your legal opinion on precedent would be interesting!

Regards
Simon P Rennie,
Director, G-SHUG Ltd
Watford

Stansted TMZ

Sir,
I'm personally affected by the proposal for the Stansted Mandatory Transponder Zone, which strikes me as an appalling development. I often fly from a private airstrip next to Hemel Hempstead under Stansted zone – it's my main route north. I'm going to have to pay a huge sum to fit a transponder to my Tipsy Nipper or make long expensive detours. It will be the latter, so this amounts to an airspace grab as far as I'm concerned. Diabolical. Please, AOPA, do what you can to knock it on the head.

Nick Bloom
Editor
Pilot magazine

*AOPA opposes the Stansted TMZ on the grounds that NATS is effectively extending the zone without having to pay for extra controllers; all the costs are foisted onto GA.
See separate story in this issue. ■

Above left: Bailey's Farm Airfield is home to Zulu Glasstek, suppliers of the Silence Twister
Below: busy schedule for Rougham Airfield

