



Flight Desk

August 2005

The official newsletter of Chesham Model Flying Club Ltd

Volume 17

Issue 4

NewGround

Sunday September 18th

Allan Crook scale competition

A chance to bring your scale creation along for a bit of friendly competition. Fly it in a scale like way and be judged on the build quality and appearance in the air.

Editors Ramblings

At this time of holidays and Summer flying, there is very little thought to the approaching deadline of the Newsletter. This has certainly caught me on the hop, along with many others, as you will see as you read on. No Members Ramblings other than my own, come on guys, make the effort.

I have had a few good flights recently, with only one loss of control caused by a battery becoming detached in flight. A manoeuvre not unknown to another club member of late. As luck would have it, the significantly lightened plane made a relatively soft landing and I got away with it. The Velcro retention system has now been beefed up. I have also been playing with a depron "shockflyer" with some pleasure. Having admired them being flown by others, I felt it was time to have some fun myself. Hopefully it will teach me some new moves whilst having enough power to weight to get out of trouble.

I have also been following a new build with some interest, It has been many months on the building table (well, years actually) but it has finally been taxied and looks ready for flight. The power to weight on this one is also enough to get it out of trouble, It is equipped with a pair of brushless Axi motors running from a 3600mAh li-po. On the ground, it sounds really sweet.



I have very little else to ramble on about, so, get your story telling hats on and send them to me at:

webmaster@cheshammodelflyingclub.co.uk

Colin Hooper

Committee Matters

The programme of events for the next few months is:

September 11 th	AHA Team Trials LIMITED CMFC FLYING
September 14 th	Committee meeting WHC 20:00
September 18 th	Allan Crook scale competition @ NG
October 19 th	AGM @ WHC 20:00
November 9 th	Committee meeting WHC 20:00
December 21 st	Club Night @ WHC 20:00

Chairman's Soapbox

NEWGROUND - HABITAT SCHEME

The field will 'topped' by our regular contractor Simon Mead in a few weeks time in accordance with our land management agreements with DEFRA. Also a designated area north of our gangmown flying area will be baled, with the large round bales placed on top of the existing stack at the northern end of the field beyond the pine trees.

NEWGROUND SHELTER – FINISHING TOUCHES

Some of you may have spotted the door is now in place in the shelter at NG. I met Ray Birdseye at Newground a couple of weeks ago and helped him fit it and stain it. Since then, we have added a handle, a retaining latch to secure it in the open position and an engraved plaque on the door just to finish it off. Also the 2 windows now have cover strip up the sides and along the top on the inside, to hide the gaps.

Two coat hooks have been screwed up, if anyone needs to hang a coat.

SOLAR POWER

A solar panel is to be purchased, along with 2 batteries to give never ending power for anyone flying electric models at Newground, so as to be able to use their own charging equipment to re-charge battery packs. The main batteries will be returned to the container to remain on constant trickle charge. Portable trolleys will be purchased / made in order to easily transport

warning of 'take-off' and 'landing' must be clearly called. No aircraft must ever be taxied toward the pits area.

3b) If helicopters are being hovered only, then this must take place on the patch and under no circumstances elsewhere on the flying area. When this takes place, no fixed wing aircraft are to be flown until the patch is clear. For helicopters flying circuits, - rule 3a above applies.

6) Only 3 (three) I/C powered models should be in the air at any one time. Actual flying should take place from the close mown patch, and the flight pattern should where practical be over our own field. **Pilots when flying must stand together on the edge of the take off and landing patch.** Do not over-fly designated 'Dead Airspace', and take care to keep powered aircraft away from any nearby dwellings and other sensitive areas.

All members, especially those who have recently joined the club are reminded to study the rules carefully and thoroughly so as not to compromise site security and the safety of all. In addition to all rules, any 'informatives' posted at either site at any time should be complied with.

NEWGROUND - AHA TEAM TRIALS SUN 11 SEPT.

The committee has responded to a request to make available Newground Field for the team trials to select the British team to compete in the 2006 European Helicopter Championships, which will be held in the UK. Club member Pete Christy will be in charge on the day. There will be no guarantee of any club flying on the day, only perhaps when the sessions have concluded, the time of which is not known. Club flying is prohibited until this time. Anyone visiting to spectate, should observe all the usual club rules, and any rules imposed on the day by Pete Christy in the interests of safety and the concentration of those taking part.

COMPETITION – SUNDAY 18TH SEPTEMBER

Don't forget the Allan Crook Memorial Scale Trophy event to be held at Newground, Richard Ginger is the current holder of this trophy, with Richard Johnson who came third last year, a previous 4 times winner. They need some strong opposition, - if you have a scale model, come and join in the fun, - BE THERE!

PEDNOR APPEAL

Well, - the Appeal is now 'up and running', and I have requested an informal hearing, which should be agreed, and this will be at the Council Offices in Amersham.

In accordance with the rules for hearings, only a brief statement of case has been made in the first instance, and this has been sent to the DOE Planning Inspectorate in Bristol, together with the application forms, supporting documents, letters and maps etc. which have already been seen by the LPA, - (local planning authority), - Chiltern District Council. A copy of the forms including the brief statement of case has been sent by me to the Council. The next step is the Council's full statement of case and the appellant's (that's us) full statement of case. Two copies of these are sent by both parties to the Inspectorate. When these have been received, we get sent the Council's full statement, and they get sent ours. Both parties are then allowed to comment on each others statement if they wish, but not allowed to supply any new evidence. All this information is then studied by the appointed Govt. Inspector, ahead of the hearing where he will lead the discussion for both parties and possibly others present to have their say and cross question each other. A site visit will follow the hearing, and may involve a 'flying demo'. For your interest the council's refusal notice and the draft of our full statement of case is shown below. I would appreciate you not disclosing this information to any third parties.

THE COUNCIL'S SCHEDULE OF REASONS FOR REFUSAL

01. The proposed extension to the number of days and times that powered aircraft can be flown would result in a significant increase in intrusive noise and disturbance which would be audible from nearby dwellings, particularly those along Pednor Road and Chartridge Lane. It is considered that the flying of powered model aircraft sporadically for four hours a day on each weekday in addition to Saturday mornings, would result in serious detriment to the amenity and quiet enjoyment of the occupants of these nearby dwellings. As such the proposal fails to comply with policies GC3 and GC7 of the Adopted Chiltern District Local Plan – 1997 (including The Adopted Alterations May 2001 and July 2004)

THE APPLICANT'S FULL AND DETAILED RESPONSE

CMFC was awarded permanent planning permission (App. No. 91/0750/CH) to fly powered model aircraft at the application site, Monday, Thursday, and Friday – 9.00am until 1.00pm.

On these days and between these times there is no condition to limit noise emissions or maximum aircraft to be in the air at one time. – FACT

The current planning permission under the terms of App. No. 91/0750/CH and granted appeal - **T / APP / X0415 / A / 93 / 225860 / P4**, complies with the policies GC3 and GC7 mentioned in the Schedule of Reasons for Refusal. - **FACT**

The Council states that the club operates in accordance with the DOE Code of Practice. - **FACT**

Chiltern District Planning policy guidance states:- The provision of a recreational facility within the open Green Belt and Chilterns AONB is acceptable, - **providing** that the open and rural character of the countryside is maintained, that it is not harmful to the amenities of neighbours, and that it achieves compliance with all other relevant Development Plan Policies. **Our current planning permission meets with these requirements. - FACT**

Regarding the application the subject of this appeal, the Council state in their report (paragraph 12) that it is considered **unreasonable** to introduce objection on Green Belt and Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty grounds. **If this is the case, then the application must comply with all other relevant Development Plan Policies, and therefore should have been approved.** There is no evidence either scientific or statistical to substantiate the Council's decision that the proposal outlined in the application '**would result in a significant increase of intrusive noise and disturbance**'. Sound levels would not increase for weekday power flying. **They would be REDUCED by condition**, - the same as that which currently applies to Saturday power flying. - **FACT**

Noise reduction, is an integral part of the application proposal. The reasons for refusal make no mention whatsoever of this. **Lower sound emissions in real terms cannot result in an increase in noise, - this is impossible.** The noise level of 82dB(A) – (club rule) for midweek power flying **with a maximum of 3 aircraft in the air at one time** would be changed to 79dB(A) **with a maximum of 2 aircraft in the air at one time.** This limitation on the number of aircraft permitted to fly together would also mean a reduction in sound emissions – **FACT**

Many powered aircraft [82dB(A)] currently eligible to fly would be prohibited. – **FACT**

Since **all** powered aircraft to be flown at the site would now be ‘restricted’ by condition, - **There would be no detriment to the amenity of any residents.**

The Council’s Health and Housing officer’s report to the Planning Dept. regarding App. No. 2003/2089/CH and concerning sound emissions, was seriously flawed and misleading.

The ‘evidence’ in the report was discredited by Peter Bird, - an Acoustics Consultant, in his statement which supported App. No. 2004/621/CH.

This statement and the officer’s report are considered relevant to this appeal.

The Health and Housing officer has provided no new report / evidence to support the refusal of the application being the subject of this appeal, stating that nothing had changed since the previous Health and Housing officer’s report to which I refer.

This particular Health and Housing officer’s report mentions the World Health Organisation’s Guidelines for Community Noise 1999, and states:-

“This guidance represents a consensus view on the effects of noise and set guideline levels below which the effects are not detected or are unimportant”.

This statement in the committee report, - omitted to include what these levels are.

Ref:- For residential buildings the daytime guidance level outside is 50 to 55 dB, - that is the average noise level over the 16 hours from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. should not exceed 50 to 55dB(A).

From the measurements provided in the Health and Housing officer’s report, the most noise the models can make at the nearest dwelling is 40dBA over 2 1/2 minutes.

It should be clear that this noise includes one aircraft tested at 82dB(A), - demonstrated only to show the difference from an aircraft silenced to 79dB(A) max. Also the noise is not only due to models but includes noise

from all other sources as well, however even this figure is significantly less than the level ***“below which effects are not detected or are unimportant”***.

The officer’s report failed to state residual noise levels, that is the measurement of the noise level without the model noise occurring.

For instance, - if the total noise was less than 6 dB above the residual noise, then the level of the model(s) cannot be accurately determined. Other noises are noted as being present but it is not noted how these interfered with the measurement of model noise.

The figures stated do not give a reliable or representative measurement of the noise that was due to the models alone and is consequently completely misleading. It also states that the daytime background levels ***“are likely to be in the low 30’s dB (A)”***.

If this is meant to put the model noise into some sort of context, then the figures should be measured and not guessed.

Simply because a model is audible does not mean that it is possible to make a reliable measurement of it’s noise level – **It can remain audible when the model noise is less than the background level.**

Also stated was that the noise was out of character (character?) with typical country acoustic environments, - however we have already been granted planning consent for the use spanning 16 years, and so consequently this point cannot be correct at the application site. No attempt is made to qualify this statement, probably because it is impossible.

The report lacks any technical merit, and its conclusion is subjective, since no set guidelines exist for qualifying noise levels for different types of noise at considerable distances.

In any case, the noise levels from aircraft silenced to 79dB(A) and below are already deemed acceptable by the Inspector who allowed the appeal against the Council’s refusal of planning application 93/0443/CH in 1993.

As stated in the DOE Code of Practice, - close to the model at 7 metres, - this measured noise level is all that is required to know regarding how 'noisy' a model aircraft is. There is no guidance given on noise levels at distance, merely separation distance based on 82dB(A).

The planning officer's report on App 2003/2089/CH is also relevant to this appeal.

It draws heavily on references made by the Inspector when he dismissed the first appeal against the refusal of planning application 90/1323/CH. Powered aircraft at the time were silenced to 82dBA at seven metres.

The Inspector who refused the first appeal, stated there should be no weekend power flying. He was referring specifically to power flying with maximum sound emissions of 82dB(A) and no conditions - **FACT**

The report on 2003/2089/CH makes note of application 93/0443/CH, thus - ***“Refused, - use would cause disturbance to local residents by reason of level of noise”***.

These reasons are stated again for the refusal of 2003/2089/CH. However on appeal against the refusal of 93/0443/CH, the Inspector allowed the appeal, imposing conditions that were an integral part of the planning application, ***to safeguard the amenity of 'neighbours'***.

These conditions were again an integral part of application 2003/2089/CH. However the report on 2003/2089/CH states in paragraph 7: -

“Although there may be some reduction in noise with the operation of fewer and quieter aircraft this is not considered to carry great weight as the aircraft would still undoubtedly be audible, well above background noise levels, from nearby residential properties to which comments of objectors attest”.

This 'consideration' is unreasonable and can only be wrong in planning terms since we already have planning permission under such conditions, **and also for the operation of noisier aircraft in greater numbers.**

The statement by the planning officer has taken no account of the Inspector's findings, when he allowed the appeal against refusal of application 93/0443/CH.

Quite amazingly his findings are included, (and ignored), by the officer in the same report on 2003/2089/CH in paragraph 6, - quote: - "***The Inspector considered the noise attenuation provided by the restriction of noise levels and the number of planes, was sufficient in order not to significantly harm neighbours amenity***".

This Inspector also said many other things, - In his decision letter the Inspector praised the club's commitment and technical ability to reduce sound emissions, proof of compliance and ability to enforce club rules/conditions and control all aspects of model flying at the site.

He also said that the Council urged that stricter controls were required for Saturdays, which they said is a day during which more residents are likely to be in their gardens.

Based on this assertion, if noise levels of 79dB(A) are currently acceptable for Saturdays, then the same noise output 79dB(A) and conditions should be even more acceptable on weekdays, given that 82dB(A) with no conditions attached is at present acceptable for weekdays under the current planning permission.

No consideration has been given to the comprehensive statistical evidence submitted by the club showing an historical level of use regarding power flying that is so low as to invalidate almost all concerns expressed in any letters of objection.

Our data, in respect of weekdays, for a typical 12 month period submitted in support of the application shows the following:-

Monday's -- only 20% of days flown, - only 4.2% of permitted total hours flown.

Thursday's -- only 2% of days flown, - only 0.5% of permitted total hours flown.

Friday's -- only 15% of days flown, - only 2% of permitted total hours flown.

The Council in their report make light of these statistics provided by the applicant, using the word '**suggest**' to describe their submission, and that flight times can be monitored by club flying logs.

To 'suggest' is 'an idea of the mind', an indication that the information has not been considered seriously. Yet it was the Council who attached an 'informative' to the original planning permission agreeing information to be recorded on the flight log sheets, and stating that they should be available for inspection by them at any time.

The applicant considers that the Council would be unable to state the days and times that a powered aircraft has been flown, or to predict the same, since they have never monitored the site, representing a time span of some 16 years. During this time no complaints have been made to the council by any third party individual or organisation regarding any aspect of the activities of the applicant – Chesham Model Flying Club.

When taken to task to explain why such statistical evidence had been ignored, both case officers, - (of the 2 applications previously refused), insisted to me that they would judge the applications as though powered flying was continuous throughout the permitted days and times. They stated that it was the potential to cause a disturbance that was their concern.

In the light of experience gained since 1992, (a considerable and reliable time span), - this concern is not valid, and is therefore wrong and unreasonable. The likely level of use for powered aircraft as perceived by the Planning Officers, which was to coincide with permitted flying times, is **unrealistic, unachievable, and cannot be substantiated in any way, using precedents or otherwise.**

The Council's concerns cannot be justified, since they do not relate to the activities of the applicant and **continue to ignore the facts relating to the applicant at the application site.**

Paradoxically, - what would be the point of a condition for a temporary use to assess the impact of any 'untried' activity on the surrounding countryside? The Council then refuses to consider the actual level of use proving it to be unquestionably acceptable in planning terms, preferring instead to refuse the application on the basis that the activity has the potential to cause disturbance, and must therefore be refused.

This is wrong and serves to penalise any organisation controlling an activity on behalf of the Local Authority, behaving in a responsible manner, and showing respect for other countryside users, - all at no cost to Council Tax Payers.

Conversely the whole essence of the Council's own gathering of statistical evidence, - whether it be in planning (i.e. – local plan) or other areas, is that it is a necessary and meaningful exercise to influence and justify their decisions made, and/or action to be taken. Indeed the gathering of statistical, substantiated evidence is the whole basis of planning for the future.

The Council has introduced '**sporadically**' to describe the flying of models over a period of time that is less than the time permitted. In their report it is suggested that such a level of use, (i.e. sporadic) would be of concern to nearby residents, - **for reasons of not being able to predict when a flight may take place**. The fact that Saturday power flying would also be limited to four hours during the five currently permitted, also gets a strange response, - '**as some sporadic flying would still take place**', - suggesting it is more acceptable to fly 'continuous' for longer hours.

All power flying at the site **has / is**, and **always will be** sporadic, for the many reasons already repeatedly stated to the Council.

The sound emissions are described by the Council as being **audible** to residents living in Pednor Road and Chartridge Lane. This may well be the case, (sometimes), but levels will not increase under the proposals that form this application, due to the **reductions** in permitted sound levels **at all times**. To describe the sound as audible and thus capable of serious detriment to the amenities of nearby residents is wrong, and cannot be substantiated, since **increased** sound levels, [82dB(A)], are already permitted under the terms of our planning permission granted by the Council.

Reduced sound levels, [79dB(A)], 'could only just be heard' in Chartridge Lane according to the Inspector who allowed the appeal against the refusal of App. No. 93/0443/CH.

It is a fact that during the last **16 years** something like **97%** of the residents of the Chartridge Lane area have **never** objected to the Council regarding model flying at the application site, and those who have, - **only ever in response to a planning application being made!**

The reduction in sound levels at all times would result in an increase of 'separation distances' beyond those termed acceptable in the DOE Code of Practice. – **FACT.**

In real terms 79dB(A) would mean, -
'The equivalent of the listener being at 700 metres distant in respect of 82dB(A)'.

Such 'separation distances' would now better our Newground site, which has 7 days a week power flying for reasons of compliance with the Code of Practice. – **FACT.** Similar 7 days a week power flying is permitted to numerous clubs nation-wide whose activities satisfy the requirements of the Code of Practice.

This was fully understood by the Inspector who allowed the appeal against the Council's refusal of App. No. 93/0443/CH.

The Inspector's findings were again acknowledged by the Council in the report of App. No. 2004/621/CH; thus -
"The Inspector considered the noise attenuation provided by the restriction of noise levels and the number of planes, was sufficient in order not to significantly harm neighbours amenity".

Elsewhere in the same report, and in paragraph 10 in the report of App. No. CH/2004/2265/FA the Council considered that, - **"Although a reduction in noise with the operation of fewer and quieter aircraft is proposed, it is not considered to carry great weight"**.

This again is wrong and unreasonable, and cannot be substantiated in any way.

It also shows contempt for the Inspector's findings, which contributed to the granting of the appeal, and seemingly ignores the very fact that we have permission for Saturday flying, granted by the Inspector, - **because of the reduction of sound levels, limited by a condition.**

Refused App. No. 2003/2089/CH as submitted, had embodied in the proposal specific reference to maximum sound emissions being 79dB(A). This was not mentioned in the description of the application sent out to interested parties and posted at the site and in the local paper.

Whether intentional or not, this was wrong and prejudiced the applicant. However, subsequently when I complained, the case officer told me that an

applicant could not request a condition, since it was up to the council to decide whether or not to consider or impose one.

This in our opinion is also wrong and unreasonable, and serves to prejudice the applicant, **especially as the application was specific to changes required to existing conditions.**

The planning officer dealing with refused App. No. 2004/621/CH informed me that a late request for a condition to limit the total time flown on any day could not be considered as it was not part of the application as submitted. She told me that **'It would obviously make a difference'**, but a new application with a fee of £110 would have to be made, which resulted in the application the subject of this appeal.

We have many times expressed in great detail the reasons why model flying in general, and in particular model flying specific to the applicant at Pednor, could never take place as imagined by the Council.

Despite this, one case officer was concerned that we, - **'might double our membership to 200'**, - **'Who might all be retired and able to fly all the time'**. Another was concerned that we, - **'might advertise in the local paper for more members'**.

Both comments are outrageously discriminatory and clearly demonstrate a keenness to consider anything that might serve to prejudice the applicant, - **yet factual and meaningful information provided by the applicant has and continues to be judged insignificant.**

The application site was described by the Council in neighbour notification notices and in the local newspaper as being adjacent to **Holloway Lane Chenies.**

The application stated quite clearly **Hollow Way Pednor.** After I pointed out this error, the site location was re-advertised as **Holloway Lane Pednor,** - still incorrect!

After reminding the case officer again, it still remained incorrect on the decision notice, and indeed even on the letter informing interested parties of the appeal.

In the circumstances this is inexcusable and demonstrates a lack of interest.

It was 'suggested' to me by a member of staff in the planning office that our applications failed because of the lack of letters of support, and perhaps we would stand a better chance with a new application, - **well supported.**

We could have easily achieved '50 plus' letters of support, but this was considered unnecessary in the light of the overwhelming amount of factual information supplied to the Council, in support of the application and the two previous ones.

It is entirely because of the extremely low usage during midweek, that current restrictions should be removed to provide a greater 'Window of opportunity' essentially for training novice pilots.

In addition the club rules would be changed to prohibit all internal combustion engine aircraft with noise levels exceeding 79dB(A) and to reduce to two (2) the number of such aircraft in the air at any time.

All of our evidence, claims, and statements in support of application CH/2004/2265 and our previous 2 applications can be substantiated, - a most important and necessary requirement as outlined in planning policy guidance.

The same cannot be said of many statements made by the Council in their attempt to justify reasons for refusal.

In consideration of the above and all other information submitted, - we ask that you allow this appeal.

David J. Humphrey
Limited

Chairman - Chesham Model Flying Club

LATEST NEWS

I have been informed by the Planning Inspectorate that they are experiencing a large volume of appeals particularly regarding those to be dealt with by the hearing procedure. As a result of this, (**wait for it**), we are not likely to be informed of a date for the hearing for at least 10 months, and that date will be about 3 months from when we are notified. This means the hearing will not be until September 2006.

Members Ramblings

We had a really pleasant evening on Wednesday 17th at Pednor with our second Silent Night of the year. Numbers were a little down on the previous evening, but it was good to see some new faces there.

Conditions for flying were absolutely ideal, virtually no wind and warm. Only the sun, low in the sky at the hut end of the field caused any problems.

There were some new models flying. Tony had his Magnetilla up, still being mastered but showing masses of power for very unscale like near vertical climbs. Bob had his Dornier 228, a kit from Robbe, to put through it's maiden flight. This had been range checked and tested thoroughly for Al to do the honours and trim out. Take off showed lots of power available, but the first turn from take off was a disaster. The model stopped responding and spiralled into the field on the other side of the track. I guess we all know that feeling. Damage was less than originally feared and after some rebuilding it should fly again. Post mortem discussions suggest that the battery to speed controller cabling is too long, causing interference.

Dick laid out a bungee for an attempt at a glider launch but conditions were not ideal with not much thermal activity to get height with. Dave flew his powered glider but eventually got bored staying up so long on his own. He claimed it was giving him a stiff neck.

More entertainment followed with a covey (?) of slingers. Al, Jezza, Geoff, Mike and Ray going for a session of mayhem. Ray was still suffering from battery ejections, despite having screwed the canopy on. He was first to "land" when, yet again, the slinger tossed the battery out and fluttered in at the top of the field. Geoff treated us to a display of inverted flying with passes that got lower and lower. Of course he finally stuffed it in inverted but suffered absolutely no damage. Those slingers are TOUGH. Jezza was content to demonstrate the power of a brushless setup and had a fair turn of speed with some good aerobatics. Al was his inimical self and flew his black slinger with aplomb. (That means he flew it well)

We had a search and rescue session for Ray's battery at the end of the evening and this time we found it. Last silent night, the grass was longer and it remained lost for several weeks. Practice obviously makes us perfect, Ray.

All in all, another good social gathering. If you missed it, try coming to the Allan Crook scale competition. It is always a pleasure to participate or just watch, and the chat is always a bonus.

Colin

Instructors Corner

Hi everyone

Hope you have all been taking advantage of the good weather in between the showers, we have had some rather nice days just lately, the usual die hards including me have been meeting at Newground over the summer, late afternoon, flying power until seven pm then lighting up the Bar-B for some sustenance then flying electric until dusk.....what a lovely end to the day, my other half Janet and my Mum came over for the food and drink as well, on occasions.....

Just recently two members have passed their 'A' certificates at Newground, namely Ray Birdseye and his son James, James who incidentally aborted two take offs safely as his trainer went crosswind (which was the sensible thing to do) so as not to go pear shaped and risk an uncontrollable take off... they flew faultlessly and answered all questions correctly, Steve Bull from Dudswell also passed his solo at Newground with hours of flight sim activity under his belt, flight sims really do help as proven by Steve as he took to the real thing like a duck to water, and with the help of Pete Conway on numerous occasions got Steve to solo status.

A VERY BIG CONGRATS TO ALL OF YOU AND HAPPY FLYING....
(inc. you Pete...!!)

I cannot count how many times I have written about the safe operation of a model engine and the dangers of rotating propellers, I am STILL seeing members operating their model engines at high revs whilst kneeling or standing in front of them, look at the photo



THIS IS WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOUR HAND COMES INTO CONTACT WITH ONEnot very nice is it...for goodness sake use your head and STAND BEHIND YOUR MODEL WHILST OPERATING OR ADJUSTING THE CARB.

SAFETY WARNING

Propellers rotating at high speed are potentially dangerous, Even small ones. The highest regard to safety must be considered before running any engine coupled to a propeller.

SAFETY GUIDE

1) Any Engine & Propeller combination should be operated in an open area and not in any confined space i.e. indoors or inside your workshop

Unless, the building is specifically designed, for propeller testing.

2) Only the operator should be in the vicinity of the rotating propeller.

3) The operator should be behind the propeller at all times and never be in line with the arc of the propeller.

4) Any spectators should always be behind the operator

Whilst on the 'safety' theme, can I remind you all again that it is a BMFA and a CMFC club rule that you have a frequency pennant on your transmitter....

The requirement for transmitter frequency pennants identifying the channel is of the utmost importance, no matter what frequency control system is in use.

It is also essential for good communication between members to be established, especially those on the same frequency, and vital that at any time the user of a particular frequency can be identified.

It is also clear that effective monitoring by the clubs' committees is required to ensure that no misuse from over familiarity with the system is creeping in, and it is vital that club committees do not tolerate members who think they know better and do not follow club rules.

We cannot overstress the importance of the role of our club committee and indeed the individual members of the club in contributing to the safety of our sport. Everyone must play their part in the effective policing of this most important aspect of model flying.

Remember

Everyone is a safety officer In their own right.

Flying at Pednor

Last Wednesday saw a beautiful evening for our electric fly-in club night (there should be a report elsewhere in this issue by Colin Hooper) if not there will be trouble..... Colin.....!!!!

This brings me to ask all of you to be extra careful with your pattern of flying circuits whilst flying at Pednor.....

One of our close neighbours popped down to see us on this particular evening I had a long chat with him, he asked very nicely when members are flying power or electric, if we would not fly too far to the south-east of the field / patch (that's to the right hand side as you are standing on the flight line) Noise does travel as we all know especially downwind so, can you make doubly sure that you are over propping AND using add on silencing to reduce the exhaust emission further. I know you all do your best. As you know I am in control of the db meter and will continue to spot check and keep tabs on you all. I have not found anyone yet in breach of the rules, that goes for the 82db rule during week days and the 79db on a Sat.

And finally make sure you all adhere to the times of flying, not one minute before or one minute over please.

RESPECT OUR NEIGHBOURS

So remember to make that that all important turn to the right of the patch that bit earlier

Thank you for your co-operation

Although the following request is aimed particularly at pilots under tuition, it also applies to any member who would like assistance in checking out their new or refitted models e.g. radio security, engine, tank, C of G etc. Please contact any of the instructors on the list before you bring the model to the flying field. They will be only too pleased to give assistance and it should ensure that your model will be safe to fly with more chance of it taking off and landing again in one piece. It will also save valuable flying time down at the field if the instructor doesn't have to spend time fiddling around rectifying problems with cold fingers and a limited supply of spares, when it could be carried out in the comfort of an instructors workshop/garage at home [it probably would only take half as long as well]. Please help us to help you.....you know it makes sense.

SEE YOU DOWN THE FIELD....HAPPY FLYING....AL

Flying Times

Pednor
 Power Monday, Thursday and Friday: - 9am to 1pm
 Power (79dB(A) max) Saturday: - 9am to 2pm
 Gliders/Electric Any daylight hours
 Newground
 Power Monday to Saturday: - 9am to 7pm
 Sunday & Bank Holidays: - 10am to 6pm
 Electric Any daylight hours

Pilot Tuition

Flying tuition is available to any junior or new members who have yet to achieve their 'solo' wings. A flying instructor will be available to attend the Pednor field each Saturday morning from 10.30am to 2.00pm weather and pupil attendance permitting. To avoid the possibility of wasting instructor's time attending an empty field please Telephone the appropriate instructor on the Wednesday or Thursday evening to confirm that you would like tuition on the Saturday.

The Instructor Rota

The rota for the next few months is as follows: -

August	20	Dave
	27	Geoff
September	3	Al
	10	Frank

	17	Dave
	24	Geoff
October	1	Al
	8	Frank
	15	Dave
	22	Geoff
	29	Al
November	5	Frank
	12	Dave
	19	Geoff

Additional instruction is available at Newground on Saturday or Sunday afternoons with Robin Thwaites. Please telephone to arrange a mutually convenient time.

For Sale and Wanted

Free!!

**Super 60
Airframe only!**

I was given this about a year ago by a club member and now it's time to pass it on to another club member.

Anyone interested, contact Ray
Birdseye