

York Aviation Report - Comments

Paragraph	Comments
SGC Report	
8.8	We should ask to see the minutes of the March 3rd workshop.
8.11/12	When did they meet with Airbus, Concorde Trust and GWAA - before or after the Options Report and/or Consultation Period?
10	<p>What opportunities? Everyone keeps saying the phrase "The closures would present new opportunities", but no-one says what opportunities they are thinking of.</p> <p>Anyone can just say this phrase, but it's only valid, if it's backed up with the ideas, proof or evidence that led them to that conclusion.</p> <p>Without anything to back it up, the phrase can only be regarded as wishful thinking and should not be used as a basis for making such an important decision.</p>
25	No serious proposal for keeping FA open has suggested it should be used for commercial aviation, so this point should not be used as a reason to close it.
55	The competence of TOR and Mott MacDonald has never been in question, just the motivation behind the conclusion of their reports, which were paid for by the same party that has a strong financial incentive to close the airfield.
74	<p>Rolls Royce has deliberately made a point to correct SGC's interpretation of their reply. They have stated that did not say "Rolls-Royce supported the closure", only that "Rolls-Royce accept the closure and do not object to it".</p> <p>Would that not mean that, if they had been asked the right question e.g. "Would you prefer that the airfield stayed open?", they would have said that they would prefer that the airfield stays open?</p>
75	This infrastructure improvement could happen regardless of whether the airfield closed or stayed open. It should not be made conditional on the airfield being closed.
76	Yes, these ideas could be possible - in fact, anything is possible - but they are at best impractical and at worst would persuade the companies to take their business elsewhere.
77	<p>Again, yes, you can say now, that aerospace activities could be safeguarded through the planning process, but will they be?</p> <p>Especially when the house building zealots are on a roll a few years down the line and they've chosen to lose sight of the importance of the aerospace sector to the economy of the area in preference of meeting housing targets and making huge wads of money from the houses and the council tax and government handouts that go along with the houses.</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

78	<p>Again, how will the closure secure the long term legacy of the aerospace industry? GKN have already attempted to take all their manufacturing to their other sites when they took on the contract. It was only prevented by a big outcry from the unions, whom I'm sure would be delighted to regale the facts.</p> <p>In fact they've already succeeded in moving the A350 work to their Easter Compton site, to the detriment of their workers, who have ended up with inferior contracts compared to the ones they had at Filton.</p> <p>The closure would only hand another golden opportunity to them on a plate and I'm sure they would jump at the chance to plead all sorts of difficulties in keeping manufacturing at Filton as a reason to gradually or in one fell swoop, move it away to their other sites.</p> <p>Manufacturing staying at Filton is by no means assured, just because of the closure.</p>
88 - Aerospace	<p>"Seen no evidence that the closure will have no detrimental effect on the aerospace activities"?</p> <p>They have haven't really thought too deeply about this one then. See the previous answer.</p> <p>There may be little evidence from outside the company, but there's plenty of historical and current activities to suggest that Airbus is not too keen on Filton.</p> <p>They may be building a new aerospace park, but will it be occupied by local residents or foreign contractors, will there still be manufacturing at Filton in 10 years time or will that have been siphoned off to other more business friendly sites?</p> <p>There are a lot of unanswered, but very valid questions that still need to be investigated.</p>
88 - Aviation	<p>Yes, there may be alternative means, but are they practical alternatives? Again, each individual option has only been considered in isolation.</p> <p>Nowhere has the option of multiple streams of income been considered as a viable option.</p> <p>Has there ever been an airport/airfield that has only had one stream of income?</p> <p>Surely, this approach to the evaluation is inadequate at best and a shameful waste of time, effort and money at worst?</p>
	<p>What is the critical mass that is referred to and how can one say that it can't be met, if no figures have been considered?</p> <p>Without further details, how can this statement be used as a reason to justify the closure?</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

	<p>As even York Aviation have themselves stated, having an operational heliport in the middle of a residential area is not really a viable or workable option.</p> <p>So it has to be assumed that the GWAA and Police helicopters will not be based at Filton for very long.</p> <p>No property developer wants to have to build an operational airport of any kind into their plans, so they will surely be using all their influence to muscle this inconvenience out of the picture.</p>
	<p>It's a false assumption to say that the sale of the airfield could not be a viable proposition if the land which Airbus occupies is not in the deal.</p> <p>The airfield has been run at a loss and a profit without the influence of the income of that land, because the land is owned by BAE Systems (Properties) Ltd. and hence the income and costs appear in the accounts for that company and not those for BAE Systems (Aviation Services) Ltd., which is the company that operates Filton Airfield.</p>
92	<p>Again, the integrity of TOR and MM have not been questioned, only the motivation towards their conclusion and the considerations they used to form the conclusion.</p>
93	<p>But were they asked the right questions?</p> <p>There only ever seems to have been questions asked regarding what they feel about the closure of the airfield e.g. "Would the closure of the airfield affect your current operations?" Of course they're going to say no to that question.</p> <p>No-one has asked them how they would feel about using the airfield, if it offered the facilities they would find useful e.g. proper, long term contracts, a stable future and a business friendly attitude towards its customers.</p> <p>Or are they afraid that the answer to this question would totally negate their argument about the viability of the airfield?</p>
Appendix 1	
23	<p>So it appears that Network Rail actually supports the continued operations of the airfield.</p> <p>However, they seem to be very concerned about the increased pressure put on the road infrastructure by many thousands of extra houses and the proximity of residential housing to their noisy, 24/7 industrial operation.</p> <p>So, it's not a unanimous support for the closure, then.</p> <p>Have they publicly supported the airfield, because BAE don't really have any hold over them?</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

Appendix 2	
Airbus	<p>Airbus may have had a record year, but this is for the company as a whole, not for Filton in particular.</p> <p>New business is already being given to other, more business friendly sites e.g. Germany, Spain, China and South Korea.</p> <p>The A400M wing was awarded to Filton several years ago, before the intention to close the airfield was made public knowledge.</p> <p>Since then very little new manufacturing has been awarded to Filton and not much design work either. The above mentioned sites have been very accepting of the new work that has been passed their way.</p>
GKN	<p>As previously stated, GKN has already attempted to move all the manufacturing to their other sites and has succeeded with the A350 work.</p> <p>It is feasible to assume that they are looking for another opportunity to try to move the rest of it.</p>
LEP	<p>Houses do not produce long term, sustainable jobs. Neither do they attract jobs to an area in and of themselves.</p> <p>So the constant statement that houses need to be built to create jobs and rebuild the economy is totally false.</p> <p>Businesses bring jobs to an area and an area like Filton that has been built up around a huge industrial complex for over 100 years, will not attract new businesses or entice existing ones to stay, if the residential sprawl is allowed to surround the areas where they operate.</p> <p>On the contrary, residential sprawl is more likely to persuade the existing businesses to relocate elsewhere and any potential new businesses to not consider Filton as a viable area in which to do business.</p>
Workshop Conclusions	<p>“Mitigation solutions are in place for when the airfield closes.”</p> <p>Could this perhaps mean, “Yes, of course we can still do business perfectly well - by moving our operations elsewhere”?</p>
	<p>Improvements in the rail and road network should not be made dependent on the closure of the airfield.</p> <p>These improvements can just as easily be made if the airfield is still operational.</p> <p>In fact, they can arguably be more easily implemented with a business and industrial base surrounding them than a residential one.</p>
	<p>It’s not enough to just keep saying “the closure offers opportunities” – what are they?</p> <p>Without any knowledge of what these “opportunities” are, how can this argument be used to substantiate the closure?</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

York Aviation Report	
2.4	<p>The 2003 Future of Air Transport White Paper laid out a need for utilising existing regional airports to mitigate the over-capacity being experienced in the London and South East airports.</p> <p>Therefore, it detailed the various options, including building new airports, for example in the area north of Bristol.</p> <p>It concluded that there is no case for supporting a new airport to the north of Bristol.</p> <p>This statement should not be taken out of context to serve the needs those pursuing the closure of the airfield. It clearly states, a new airport, not existing ones like Filton.</p> <p>Utilising the facilities of existing airfields is clearly an excellent solution that would easily mitigate the stated problems.</p> <p>Filton Airfield has all the navigational facilities already in place and ready to be used.</p> <p>Only a relatively modest investment would be needed to provide more modern apron facilities, which could easily be recouped within a few years of operation and some of which could be paid for from the operational profits.</p>
2.9	<p>The Scoping Document itself states that existing airport infrastructure should be utilised and York Aviation has acknowledged this.</p> <p>It could be argued that closing an airport is not utilising that airport's infrastructure very well and is not really supporting the intention of the statement.</p>
2.13	<p>"The long term operation of the airfield is crucial to the prosperity of the area" does not necessarily mean just the aerospace sector.</p> <p>There are many other "beyond the fence" business activities as well, that also depend on the airfield. These jobs would still survive, even if the aerospace sector moved away.</p> <p>There have been many reports created over many decades from many different sources around the world, showing the enormous economic benefit that an airfield brings to an area. Not just in the immediate vicinity, but over a much wider area around the airfield.</p> <p>This statement should not be used to focus entirely on the few large aerospace businesses.</p> <p>Although they may provide the great majority of visible jobs, there are many other businesses that together also provide many hundreds, perhaps thousands of ghost jobs that aren't immediately obvious. It is these that will be put at risk and lost, if the airfield closes.</p>
2.17	<p>Is table 2.1 at all relevant?</p> <p>No-one has suggested that Filton Airfield should become a passenger airport, so what relevance is there to the investigation of a comparison of passenger movements?</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

2.18	<p>The SFA submission document showed quite clearly that although movements at other airports declined, those at Filton Airfield remained relatively steady throughout the last 10 years.</p> <p>So again, this comparison is meaningless.</p>
2.19-21	<p>Totally irrelevant for the same reason as above.</p>
2.22	<p>So even York Aviation have identified that where two airports in close vicinity are targeting different markets, they can help the growth of each other.</p> <p>Another plus for keeping Filton Airfield open then? As Filton will be not be targeting the passenger market it will not be competing with Lulsgate.</p>
2.47	<p>Airbus and Rolls-Royce “appear to be” committed to retaining and developing their presence at Filton. (Quotes added for emphasis)</p> <p>So York Aviation also have their doubts about the validity of the public statements made by these two companies, then?</p> <p>They have even reiterated that both companies “do not oppose the closure” (Quotes added for emphasis again).</p> <p>As stated before, this may not mean that the companies are happy with the closure, just that they currently have no reason to oppose it.</p> <p>Perhaps the right question should be put to them to see what they would say, if the airfield remained open and offered a favourable business environment?</p>
3.4	<p>The sale may not have been completed, but reports show that it is very likely that the JCB heir will buy it and his business consortium are seriously considering keeping the runway as they see a business advantage of doing so.</p>
3.5	<p>The lack of demand was deliberately created by BAE as a result of their attempt to run the airfield down, so it cannot be used as an accurate reflection of the real marketplace.</p> <p>SFA has obtained numerous examples of BAE turning away new enquiries to use the airfield or imposing contractual conditions too restrictive to allow any business to seriously consider using the airfield.</p>
3.6/7	<p>The competence of TOR and MM were never in question.</p>
3.11	<p>If the detail is not known, no conclusion can be drawn either way. Therefore, it would be incorrect to assume that it would not alter BAE’s conclusions.</p> <p>More accounting detail might indeed show a clear route to viability if it showed that creative accounting had been used to compile the accounts.</p> <p>Not illegal activity, just that if it was known how the figures were arrived at, it may be possible to see the reason for the anomalies detailed in the SFA document.</p> <p>In fact, a professional and competent accountant did spot a possible accounting technique which could easily explain the paper losses and why they weren’t directly related to the income and expenditure generated by the airfield activities. This was detailed in the SFA document.</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

	<p>If the losses weren't directly related to the airfield activities, then it's entirely possible that the airfield itself has been profitable for the last 10 years and that it could continue to be so in the future.</p> <p>Hence the unviability argument used by BAE as the prime reason that closure is the only option, is entirely without basis.</p>
3.12	<p>This is a shaky assumption to make, if the previous comment is taken into consideration.</p>
3.16	<p>If it's unclear whether or how far any marketing follow up went, any conclusion drawn from this can only be speculative and hence should not be used as the basis of any serious decision making.</p> <p>On the contrary, the available evidence shows that no serious marketing or follow up was done with the airfield by BAE. Therefore the conclusion must be drawn that with proper marketing and follow up, significantly more business would have been secured for the airfield during the same period.</p> <p>In fact, SFA has been informed by reliable sources that the airfield has had a multitude of approaches by businesses to both use the airfield and to buy it.</p> <p>All enquiries were either dismissed or not seriously considered by the management of BAE Systems (Aviation Services) Ltd.</p>
3.19	<p>If the report was to "undertake an economic impact assessment of the aviation activity at Filton", why would it only compare the options available after closure.</p> <p>Would it not be more reflective of the true situation, if it compared the options available with the airfield active to those available if it was closed?</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

Table 1	
Section 2 – Need	Assessing Air Cargo on its own is unrealistic, because airports don't operate only one income stream.
	<p>“An air cargo operator would prefer Lutsgate over Filton”?</p> <p>Lutsgate has an infamously poor transport infrastructure, whereas Filton has direct access to both the M4 and M5 and a mainline rail line.</p> <p>Filton has a far longer runway and first class navigational facilities.</p> <p>So how can this conclusion possibly be reached?</p>
Viability	<p>Why would there be limited operations?</p> <p>If Filton has no passenger operations to worry about, freight flights could take place whenever they were needed.</p>
Environmental Impacts	<p>Most take offs at Filton occur in a westerly direction, so there would be very little noise impact, which is similar to the current situation.</p> <p>The runway is long enough that even with Easterly take offs, most aircraft are airborne long before the end of the runway and are at several thousand feet before they reach any housing development.</p> <p>Together with the fact that modern aircraft are far quieter and far less polluting nowadays, any concerns about noise or air pollution are relatively unfounded and mainly speculative.</p>
	<p>Why would road movements pose a problem?</p> <p>The A38 is doesn't run very close to many residential areas, so any increase in traffic would have little impact on those areas.</p> <p>The alternative route out of the airfield is along the new road past Cribbs Causeway. This route passes through no residential housing other than those being built on the Charlton Hayes housing estate, which is only on one side of the road.</p> <p>It would probably not have many houses built very close to it either considering it is a dual carriageway and has a relatively high movement rate already.</p> <p>This would most likely be the preferred route for any industrial or freight businesses due to the noise mitigation it would offer.</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

<p>Section 3 – BAE/MM</p>	<p>As detailed earlier, the lack of demand has been a deliberate ploy by BAE through not offering a credible service to potential users of the airfield.</p>
<p>Demand</p>	<p>The number of air taxi and business aviation movements at Lulsgate has been very low, most likely due to its terrible transport infrastructure.</p> <p>This is not a problem at Filton, so it would most likely attract far more of these services and enjoy far more movements than seen at Lulsgate.</p>
	<p>As stated earlier and shown in the SFA document, the movements at Filton Airfield have remained relatively stable throughout the last 10 years, despite the decline at other airports.</p> <p>So this cannot be used as evidence of not enough demand.</p>
	<p>So, if northern Bristol is a main attracter of air taxi users and it has a majority share in the market, that would mean that this stream of income is a very viable one, wouldn't it?</p> <p>Airbus and BAE's use of air taxis cannot be discounted, because they would continue to use the airfield and hence contribute to the income from this stream.</p> <p>Therefore, both aerospace and non-aerospace demand for the air taxi service would be a very viable profit centre for Filton.</p>
	<p>The assumption that the aircraft based at Gloucester and Cotswold airports must be there for the reason that the owner lives there, is a very broad and unsound one.</p> <p>There may be many reasons that an aircraft is based at an airport other than that fact that the owner lives nearby. Not least the cost of basing an aircraft there.</p> <p>SFA has more than one GA pilot as a member and from quite a few comments received from members of the public who are also GA pilots, while collecting petition signatures, the main reason why they don't use Filton Airfield either for visiting or for basing their aircraft there, is the cost. They have also all said that they would prefer to be based at Filton, if the fee structure was more attractive to GA operators.</p> <p>The same is true for the business operators that were based at Filton before they were forced out by BAE. They have all said that they would have preferred to be based at Filton, if the environment was more business friendly.</p> <p>This must now negate any assumptions and arguments that pilots and aviation businesses prefer to be located elsewhere, than at Filton.</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

Need	<p>Lulsgate may certainly be able to handle the air taxi services, but it is well known that it is not the preferred airport for businesses who wish to use it, because of its poor location.</p> <p>Airbus Filton personnel are increasingly using Heathrow for their continental flights and declining to use Lulsgate to get to Broughton, because of the inconvenience of the location of Lulsgate.</p>
	<p>Lulsgate's expansion beyond its current boundary is still speculative, because it's not certain whether this will either be allowed by the local council or provided for within the airport's master plan.</p>
Viability	<p>Again, why is this being considered purely from a standalone perspective. Doing that is not reflective of any real life scenario.</p> <p>This income stream, like all the other considered here, should be considered within the context of a mixed use airfield business.</p>
Conclusions	<p>The relocation of Business Aviation to local alternatives is definitely not the most desirable solution, nor the most practical one.</p> <p>Why would the retention of Filton not stimulate further business aviation growth? That may be the case if the current anti-business environment was maintained.</p> <p>However, if the airfield operator were to be far more business friendly, offer more favourable and realistic terms to its customers and provide a long term and stable future for the airfield, then there would be far more interest in using Filton from both businesses and private individuals.</p> <p>This has all been confirmed by multiple past users of the airfield, so is based on sound evidence.</p>
Section 4 - GA Services	
Demand	<p>The sector may have been in decline, but the movements at Filton over the last 10 years show its demand to have been steady.</p>
Need	<p>Of course there would be enough capacity at other airports, but that is not the issue.</p> <p>The issue at hand is: Would GA pilots choose to use Filton, if it was still an option?</p> <p>The evidence from the pilots themselves is an undeniable yes. Therefore, this cannot be used as an excuse to close down Filton.</p>
Viability	<p>Again, this should be considered as part of a mixed use operation, not standalone.</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

Section 5 - Helicopters	
Demand	<p>“The demand has been almost exclusively from the GWAA”?</p> <p>What about the Police helicopter? It’s seen flying around Bristol far more than the GWAA one.</p> <p>Both of those helicopters are active users of the airfield, so the focus should not be put on just one of them.</p> <p>The level of activity of each service is dependent on totally different factors that are in no way connected. So the number of movements of each should not be used as an indication of the relative desire to use the airfield.</p> <p>Although their presence is not as visible, there are certainly other private helicopters that use the airfield and hence bring in further income.</p> <p>Again, if this operation was marketed more aggressively and given a more enticing business environment than BAE has been willing to offer, then there would most probably be far more demand from private operators than there has been up until now.</p>
Section 6 - MRO	
Conclusions	<p>Again, if this activity was a part of a mixed use operation, then it would definitely be a viable activity for Filton.</p>
	<p>SFA has learned that Virgin have approached BAE to use Filton as a maintenance base, but again, the airfield management were not receptive to the enquiry.</p> <p>BA have reached capacity at their South Wales base, so Filton could be a viable alternative, if acceptable terms were offered.</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

Section 7 - Aerospace	
Demand	Transportation of A400M wings by road is still speculation. It has not yet been proven to be either viable or practical.
Need	If Airbus find that the transportation of A400M wings by road turns out to be impractical or too expensive and the airfield has been closed, so is no longer an option, what would they do? Oh yes, they would move the manufacturing to another site. Easy for Airbus. Not so good for Filton, as many jobs would be immediately lost, never to be replaced. Is wishful thinking and speculation a viable plan to pursue in deciding the future of the region?
Environmental Impacts	“Large transport aircraft would generate significant noise on take off”? Has anyone heard the A400M take off? It is incredibly quiet and takes off in a remarkably short distance. It’s also a turbo prop airplane, so is potentially far noisier than a jet transporter, yet it isn’t. Modern aircraft are really very quiet compared to those in the past, so, as stated before, concern about noise from aircraft is only speculation, especially at Filton, where the majority of take offs are over open land, not over housing.

York Aviation Report - Comments

<p>Section 8 - Air Bridge Flights</p>	
<p>BAE/MM Conclusion</p>	<p>As before, it may be possible, but it is impractical and undesirable from the Airbus personnel point of view, which why they choose to use Heathrow by preference. Heathrow is not the most desirable option, but is regarded as the most convenient of the available options.</p> <p>Filton offers a far more desirable and practical environment in which to offer these services, so it would be the location of choice, if it were to continue offering this service.</p>
<p>Demand</p>	<p>York Aviation state they are not aware of any other aerospace companies offering a dedicated air shuttle service ... except Ford, who run their own air shuttle service.</p> <p>Um, so they are aware of another dedicated air shuttle service, then.</p>
<p>Need</p>	<p>Of course it's possible for Airbus to continue to operate its air bridge flights from Lulsgate, but if asked, they would probably agree that they would choose to use Filton by preference, if it continued to offer the ability to run the service from there.</p> <p>So to say that it's possible to use other locations is an irrelevant argument, because the desirability of using a certain location is what determines where the business and hence income ends up.</p> <p>In this case, it would end up in Filton's bank account and is therefore a viable profit centre.</p>
	<p>Of course, air bridge flights are not an essential part of a business, in the same way as running a corporate jet for a CEO is not an essential part of a business.</p> <p>However, it is a desirable part of a business, as it enables the business to be run more efficiently and effectively, enabling more business to be done more quickly and hence increasing the sales and income for the business.</p> <p>So, again this argument is rendered quite irrelevant for being used to decide whether an airfield is viable.</p>
<p>Viability</p>	<p>Agreed, they are not a significant factor in the airfield's income, but they are a desirable service to offer, as part of a greater mixed use package, because it is just one of the factors that attract businesses to stay at the airfield and use its other facilities.</p>
<p>Environmental Impacts</p>	<p>Agreed, it probably wouldn't increase, but not because there's no apparent demand, because there is.</p> <p>It wouldn't increase significantly, because the aircraft being used for the air bridge service are modern, quiet and less polluting than they were in the past.</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

<p>Conclusions</p>	<p>Yes, the aerospace activity would be threatened, because business meetings are already being preferred to be held on the continent, rather than at Filton.</p> <p>Continentially based managers are very reluctant to travel to Filton for meetings for the reasons explained before.</p> <p>As Filton has been run down, it has been regarded less and less as a preferred site and new manufacturing business has been given to other Airbus sites.</p> <p>If Filton cannot provide a business friendly environment and is difficult to get to, it follows that the management will look elsewhere to carry on the significant parts of the business.</p> <p>With this becoming more prevalent, it won't take long before Filton will become the backwater of Airbus and the jobs it now provides will disappear to other sites, never to be replaced.</p>
<p>Section 9 - Mixed Use Operation, including smaller operations as detailed in the SFA document.</p>	<p>Yet again, this option has not been considered.</p> <p>The most realistic and viable option is for all the above activities, except for commercial passenger operations, to be part of a mixed use package offered by Filton Airfield.</p> <p>No business should attempt to survive on just one income stream. That would just be commercial suicide.</p> <p>If all the above activities were to be combined with effective marketing, the potential for a very profitable airfield operation would be entirely possible.</p> <p>If this type of going concern were to be offered to the business community, there would be a significant amount of interest and a very good price would be able to be obtained by BAE.</p> <p>And the whole region would have the potential for being very prosperous into the future on the back of Filton Airfield.</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

4. Conclusions	
4.4	<p>There probably isn't much more detail to discover other than what is already known about the operation of Filton Airfield.</p> <p>As it has been deliberately run down into a shell operation by BAE over the last 10 years, there isn't much of the current operation left to offer.</p> <p>However, there is much potential still left that, with a positive and proactive management, could turn Filton Airfield into very profitable business that could be a strong leader of economic recovery in the area, which is, after all, what the government is wanting, isn't it?</p>
4.5	<p>Already covered and counteracted. Alternative locations are not practical solutions to closing the airfield.</p>
4.7	<p>Does it have to be a "clear need" decision to determine whether the airfield stays open?</p> <p>As shown, there is a "clear potential" for the airfield to be a very profitable business and a very good stimulant for the whole region.</p> <p>If they were asked the right question, the aerospace businesses would most likely agree that they would desire the airfield to remain operational and that, although it may not be essential for the running of their business, it would definitely be desirable and would be a strong enticement to keep important parts of their business based at Filton.</p> <p>Other businesses are known to either wish to operate from Filton or buy it and private pilots are also known to wish to base themselves there.</p> <p>So it should be a "Clear Potential" decision that should be applied to decide whether Filton Airfield should stay operational, NOT a clear need.</p>
	<p>Yes, BAE might have judged the airfield to be unviable, but there are many questionable reasons and activities that led to that decision, most of which can be refuted very easily.</p>
	<p>There is no obvious reason for the statement by York Aviation that the airfield would be an unattractive proposition, if it wasn't sold with the land on which the aerospace sector resides.</p> <p>As stated before, this land belongs to BAE Systems (Properties) Ltd., not BAE Systems (Aviation Services) Ltd. Therefore, any income from this land is not part of the airfield's income, so would be irrelevant to the purchase of the airfield.</p> <p>The land would definitely be an attractive bonus, but given that it's entirely possible for the mixed use operational activities to stand on their own merit, there's no reason to speculate that a potential buyer would retreat from the purchase, just because the aerospace land is not part of the deal.</p>

York Aviation Report - Comments

4.8	<p>The Options Report does cover a lot of the potential business activities. However, it only considers each option in isolation, ignoring the obvious and most realistic option of a mixed use business package.</p> <p>This must be regarded as a major omission, especially if the report is intended to be used to make such an important decision that could potentially affect the future of such a wide range of people and businesses.</p> <p>Perhaps the majority of the items in the report may be factually accurate in isolation, but the way the facts have been used to draw its conclusions are very questionable, to say the least.</p> <p>As stated above, the postulation that the closure decision should be based on a case of “clear need” is not a fair or realistic judgement.</p> <p>A far more realistic and fairer basis for the decision should be a judgement of a “Clear Potential” for it to be successful in its own right, rather than predicating it on whether the aerospace companies really need it.</p> <p>If a business has a clear potential, should it not at least be given a chance to prove itself, before it is written off?</p> <p>The last 10 years of operation under the stewardship of a management who obviously had no regard for the well being of the business, clearly cannot be used as proof that it has already been given a chance and failed.</p> <p>The business needs to be given a chance with a management that has a track record of having the operation of an airfield as their prime concern, without the pressure of a higher level management that wishes to only maximise its return on the value of the underlying land.</p> <p>If it can make a profit for several years running, then this would prove that Filton Airfield is not a lost cause and can be turned into the success that it has the potential of being.</p> <p>If not, then the case for closure has been definitively proven and Filton Airfield should be closed.</p> <p>Perhaps this is the challenge that should be risen to now, instead of basing the decision on some dubious, ill conceived conclusions and backroom deals?</p>
Appendix 4	
BAE Accounts	Referring to the years 2009 and 2010, how can a business make either a profit or a loss, when there is no income or expenditure?