

FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 27th February 2020 at RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL

Philip	Riley	Chairman
Whittacre	Hope	Secretary
Chris	Axam	Hart District Council
Brian	Edmunds	Farnham Town Council
Christina	Harris	Church Crookham Parish Council
Norman	Lambert	Crondall Parish Council
Christina	Main	Mytchett Deepcut & Frimley Green
Geoff	Marks	FARA
Charlotte	Morley	Surrey County Council
Brandon	O'Reilly	Farnborough Airport Ltd
James	Radley	Hart District Council
Jenny	Radley	Fleet & Church Crookham Society
Gareth	Saunders	Church Crookham Parish Council
Maurice	Sheehan	Rushmoor Borough Council
Miles	Thomas	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Roger	Walker	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Wally	Epton	WJE Associates

Item 1 – Apologies Received:

John	Tonks	Ash Parish Council
Virginia	Barratt	Farnborough College of Technology
Ben	Gleeson	Farnborough International
Ross	McNally	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
Emma	Watts	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
Maggie	Gault	NATS
Ian	Dickson	NATS
Neil	Turner	NATS
Josephine	Hawkins	Surrey Heath Borough Council

Item 2. Minutes of Meeting held on 27th June 2019 and Matters Arising

Three small corrections were requested; the Minutes were approved as amended.

Actions from last Meeting:

- The Committee asked the Secretary to arrange a presentation from ICCAN.
- Roger Walker asked to circulate possible dates for meetings.
- Brandon O'Reilly took an action to include in the opening paragraph of the report the weekend heavy aircraft movement limit of 270 per annum.
- Roger Walker agreed he would do his best to accelerate the dates of meetings with the CAA and Stakeholders regarding ACP.
- Roger Walker would raise the questions with the CAA and report the response.

All actions were closed or completed.

1. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman indicated he would accept intervention throughout the meeting from Members as usual but asked members of the public to kindly wait for Item 7 on the Agenda, to ask questions or make comments.

The Chairman referred to the Constitution and Purpose of the FACC. He read out the following excerpt:

The purpose of the FACC is to provide a means of consultation with respect to any matter, including noise, air quality, safety and environmental impact, concerning the operation, management and development of the aerodrome which affects the interests of the users of the aerodrome, the local authorities in whose area the aerodrome or any part thereof is situated or whose area is in the neighbourhood of the aerodrome, and other organisations representing the interests of people concerned within the locality in which the aerodrome is situated.

The Chairman advised that a number of questions from the public at the last meeting, related to matters other than those listed above and therefore were not appropriate for discussion at this forum; should similar questions be tabled at this meeting, they would be ruled out of order

Item 3. ICCAN Presentation by Howard Simmons and Sheila Honey.

The presentation and other literature supplied by ICCAN can be found on the FACC website.

James Radley asked if ICCAN had experience of how ACP was changing the noise contours around airports across the country?

Howard Simmons responded that indeed there would be changes as a result of ACP. The work that ICCAN does is generally related to commercial airports rather than general aviation airports such as Farnborough. To date ICCAN has only studied commercial passenger and freight flight activity. HS did say there was nothing to stop ICCAN providing advice to general aviation in the future.

The Chairman thanked Howard Simmons and Sheila Honey for their time and for giving an interesting presentation.

HS offered to return in a year to update on the progress of ICCAN.

Item 4. Airspace Change Process – Update from Roger Walker

ACP came into effect at 7:00 this morning.

Although there has been a significant amount of planning to ensure a smooth trouble-free transition, as one might expect there have been some minor glitches. But generally, all is going well. RW advised that the safety of the airport operation for users and stakeholders alike, is of the utmost consideration when implementing a significant change such as this.

RW referred to the request of the Committee at the last meeting, to be available to meet with stakeholders and discuss the ACP process. There was not an opportunity to do this in a timely manner. Implementation was approaching while operating requirements were still in a state of change.

It was for this reason FAL decided to create the Airspace Change & Flight Paths at Farnborough Airport FAQ Document and circulate to the Committee. This is now also available to the wider public on the FACC and RBC websites.

Jenny Radley- Fleet & Church Crookham Society and Geoff Marks - FARA, were supplied with advance drafts of the FAQ's and had a meeting with FAL to discuss and comment, ahead of its official release.

RW announced that WebTrak was available on the FAL website. This facility allows sight of the airspace around Farnborough Airfield movements with a slight delay from the comfort of your own home.

RW referred to the October Meeting when he undertook to raise the questions with the CAA and report the response and said these had in part been overtaken by events. For example, it had been thought CAP 725 would be applied but the CAA has now advised it will apply CAP1616.

As regards the ACP Post Implementation Review ("PIR"), usually this commences after 12 months. In the case of Farnborough Airport, CAA has indicated it requires an interim report within 6 months with a final one at 12 months.

Collection of data required to complete the reports, has already commenced.

In addition to this, the CAA has asked FAL to find a way to monitor aircraft activities outside the monitored airspace. This is not a usual requirement. Designing a system to recognise and analyse these movements is underway; FAL is working closely with NATS to do this. RW indicated that this, in itself, moves the rules away from the definition in CAP 1616.

That concluded RW's report.

Jenny Radley asked if the FAQs were to be put on the RBC website? Additionally, she paid credit to FAL for putting together the FAQs and distributing them to the Committee.

RW responded, as yet the FAQs were not on the RBC website but felt that the Airport and FACC sites provided good access for the public.

Jenny Radley asked RW if FAL is prepared to offer follow up meetings to local communities in support of the ongoing ACP activity?

RW responded positively. He appreciated that local stakeholders would want updates and information as quickly as possible. However, for the preceding reasons and ongoing discussions with the CAA, it would be hard to have a meaningful update before September once the summer holidays were completed

RW indicated he had already been approached by Church Crookham PC to address a meeting and provide an update.

The Chairman summarised - saying he felt the FAQs were an excellent idea and they appear to have been well received by the Committee. The additional maps and the introduction of WebTrak were also appreciated.

The Secretary had previously circulated to the Committee the following observation from Geoff Marks -FARA

I consider it necessary to question the CAA's environmental assessment of the airspace change proposal, given its bottom line is that no overall environmental benefit accrues from the projected changes in the use of the Class D airspace.

Rushmoor's planning permission addresses noise through LAeq contours, annual movement limits, and its concurrence with noise preferential routes proposed by the operator.

The annual movement limits were established by Rushmoor because the LAeq contours will not constrain noise impacts to an acceptable level. The movement limits can be regarded as a 'proxy' for an acceptable noise threshold in the absence of metrics such as SEL, which better represent the noise impacts upon communities.

These planning conditions are legally binding on Rushmoor and the operator. Both sides, presumably, are therefore content that the utilisation of the Class D airspace will not lead to the planning conditions being breached.

This begs the question as to what useful purpose the CAA environmental assessment serves, as its findings cannot take precedence over the environmental conditions/ tolerability thresholds in the planning permission.

The CAA's CAP 1616, at Appendix B paragraph B54, refers to 'primary' and 'secondary' noise metrics. 'Primary' noise metrics are those used to quantify WebTag inputs. Secondary noise metrics, such as N65, Lmax, and SEL are said to be important because, unlike LAeq, they convey noise effects.

The questions for the CAA arise because its assessment does not take secondary metrics into account, nor does it refer to the Lowest Observed Adverse Effects LEVEL

(LOAEL) of 51dB LAeq. If such metrics and contours based on the 50,000 permitted movements were applied in the post implementation review process, the outcomes would aid communications with local communities, and in the longer term form a more satisfactory baseline against which the noise impacts of any future planning application for growth may be predicted and judged.'

The Chairman thanked GM for this and suggested the Committee should be asked if they support sending a letter to the CAA.

The Chairman suggested that GM drafts an initial letter, sends this to all members of the Committee for their comments, suggestions and ultimately their approval for it to be sent to the CAA.

The Chairman indicated that he feels that approval should be given subject to the terms of the Constitution and would require a 50% majority for adoption before approval is given for it to be sent. This was agreed by the Committee.

GM indicated that this needs to be done quickly and he suggested that it should be completed by the end of April.

James Radley – Hart District Council, provided his thoughts on the voting mechanism and noted generally that he was disappointed by the poor turnout of Committee members at this meeting. He asked what would happen if we had the same poor response from the proposed circulation of the letter above?

GM in response suggested that the Secretary should make it clear when sending the drafts that confirmation of receipt is required and as is their vote for or against sending the letter to the CAA

Action: The Secretary to liaise with the Chairman and GM.

Item 5. Information Report – From Brandon O'Reilly

Brandon reported 2019 was a record-breaking year for the airport with over 32,000 movements, up 5% on the previous year. This level of activity represents 63% of currently approved capacity.

This year through February has seen a 3.9% increase in movements.

RAF Northolt is still operating at weekdays 8a till 4pm only for civilian traffic.

As reported at the last meeting, the airport has a new owner, Macquarie Infrastructure and Real Assets ("MIRA"). As a consequence, FAL is undergoing a rebranding. A screen shot of the new logos was presented. The original TAG brand was offered for sale to the new owner who declined to buy it.

The new Gulfstream facility is on schedule. It is now externally complete and watertight. It will have a soft opening on 8th June and will be partly operational for FIA.

Gulfstream is currently recruiting some 300 people to work at the facility together with other employees it will transfer from Luton.

At the launch event itself, Gulfstream want to offer clients the ability to buy sustainable aviation fuel SAF. FAL will do everything they can to make this available on site. SAF currently costs 6 times as much as normal aviation fuel and can only be obtained from limited sources.

As mentioned before by Brandon, the adoption and use of sustainable aviation fuel will only happen if it is readily available with manufacturers and operators alike supporting its use. Brandon recognised the challenge and applauded the support from Gulfstream.

FAL has recently completed the planting of 1,000 trees at Southwood Meadow. This is part of the ongoing programme with RBC. More sites are to be agreed.

Finally, Brandon told of his exploits as a dragon when he participated on the panel of the Inter-Schools' Dragon's Den Competition hosted at Calthorpe Park School.

As mentioned previously, the rebranding process was launched in January 2020 and is now well underway.

Item 6. Report Update – from Miles Thomas

The Reports provided to the Members 'were taken as read'.

Jenny Radley noted that 75% of complaints in the report referred to Chapter 4 aircraft. She asked, what proportion of the aircraft using the airport are Chapter 4?

MT responded that all jet aircraft using the airport were Chapter 4. Prop, turboprop aircraft and helicopters are classified by a different Chapter category.

Item 7. Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public.

Julia Longrigg - Greater Rushmoor Against War ("GRAW") asked the following questions:

1. To the Farnborough International Delegate.

What moral responsibility does the Exhibition Centre have to events hosted within it? For example hosting the DPRTE (which the Campaign Against the Arms Trade describe as an Arms Fair) in 2019 and the pending Home Office event which will welcome Hikvision a company blacklisted by the USA for producing surveillance equipment used to suppress human rights, against China's Turkic minorities.

No one from Farnborough International attended the meeting. The Secretary forwarded the question and received the following written response:

Farnborough International is a wholly owned subsidiary of ADS Group – the UK trade association for the aerospace, defence, security and space industries.

The defence industry makes a strategically important contribution to the UK economy and is fundamental to protecting and promoting national security.

Farnborough is home to some of the world's leading defence companies which provide valuable local employment, and both Farnborough and Aldershot have a long-held and proud association with the UK's Armed Forces.

The Farnborough International Exhibition and Conference Centre operates according to a comprehensive licence agreement which places clear stipulation around the types of events that can take place.

The DPRTE event is a procurement event for the defence industry and not the type of event portrayed by Campaign Against the Arms Trade.

In relation to the question about Hikvision, it is not our position to provide comment on specific companies. Farnborough International will follow guidance from the Home Office for the UK's position on international issues. We can however comment that Hikvision will no longer be participating in the Security and Policing event being held next week.

The Farnborough International Exhibition and Conference Centre asked the Secretary to advise Members and all attendees to refer any questions relating to their business directly to them. This includes those asked by Julia Longrigg.

The Farnborough International Exhibition and Conference Centre asked the Secretary to publish the following email address: enquiries@farnborough.com

2. A question to the FACC Committee.

Please would the Committee have a show of hands to show their support, in principle, for me to organise a Public Information Meeting about Farnborough Airport, its use and its future to be held at The Princess Hall, in mid-May, or a date convenient to the FACC committee.

The Chairman responded, GRAW did not need the support of the FACC to hold a meeting about the airport or any other matter.

Chris Axam asked JL if she felt the Committee was not doing what it should? What is missing?

JL responded that if members do not attend, nothing can be achieved. The FACC does not advertise itself so no one knows it is there to help them and there was no way to address the issues around the airport or make complaints.

Jenny Radley indicated that Farnborough Airport did provide a complaints telephone line and e-mail address and this was available on the FACC and RBC

web-site, saying that it was only this morning that she had been on the website to check.

For the avoidance of doubt, the Chairman read out the website address for FAL and the complaints email address and phone number.

Jenny Radley and Miles Thomas advised how residents with any issue can register their issue with their MP, their Councillor, RBC, their local council, parish council, resident association or the airport itself. FAL has a complaint help line and email address.

The Secretary advised that the dates and times of meetings are advertised in the Hampshire Independent.

JL asked why there was no advertising on local radio and why are meetings held during the day rather than in the evening?

GM and James Radley both offered to attend a meeting with JL to talk about local issues regarding the airport and the work done by the FACC.

3. A question to FACC.

What is the FACC's view on the consequences to the environment and the local community, of the proposed widening of the Lynchford Rd into a 4-lane highway by Hampshire County Council who justify this to get more traffic to the airfield.

The Chairman responded, this was not a question for the Committee, it was rather for Hampshire County Council.

4.A question for RBC and FACC.

The Farnborough Airport Area Action Plan lists about 9 policy documents (map changes, preferred approach, sustainability, habitats regulation assessment, airport consultation, key sites etc) these were completed in 2009. These policies were produced a decade ago. When and how will RBC update them to ensure the public are involved and aware of rapid changes affecting the area in which they live and work?

The Chairman responded this is not something FAL or the FACC can comment on. This question should be directed to RBC.

A question from Keith Oborn: The 23rd Feb was the end of the English school half term. On that day approximately 40% of arrivals at Farnborough came from airports serving Alpine ski resorts. Over 50% came from "holiday destination" airports.

Analysis shows that most, if not all, of these aircraft had previously made the reverse journey, likely empty.

The previous weekend shows the opposite pattern.

Each journey to or from Farnborough results, on average, in the emission of 3 tonnes of CO2 per passenger. This is 30 times the emission from an equivalent commercial flight, and at least 250 times the emission from high speed rail.

How is this waste of resources and pollution justified by all concerned?

Brandon O'Reilly responded; we do not justify it. It is a matter for the aircraft owners.

KO: Thank you. Your response has been recorded for future use.

Extinction Rebellion Representative asked: The government has brought forward the date to stop selling combustion engine and hybrid cars to 2035 (and may bring it even earlier). It has committed to be carbon zero by 2050 and the Heathrow decision today confirms this intention. Has Farnborough Aerodrome considered the likelihood of the government banning private jets and what would the impact be on jobs and investment if that were to happen?

Extinction Rebellion Representative, Farnborough Aerodrome has planted 1,000 trees, which is great and I hope you will continue to do this every year. I also hope you will invest in green technologies as the aerodrome is relying heavily on carbon offsets to achieve its carbon neutral operation. Carbon offsetting is not an acceptable way to mitigate CO2 impact and the global COP26 meeting in November is likely to confirm this.

Brandon O'Reilly responded he was open to any ideas or proposals.

Hugh Sheppard, Hampshire branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England asked Howard Simmons of ICCAN, do the new flight paths as implemented with ACP push aircraft into other areas? Are these being monitored and do we know the effects?

Howard Simmons responded, this was a very good question but that it was too early to say what the effects would be and until data was collated numbers would not be known. He did offer that if had any useful information on this he would bring it to the next meeting.

Reg Milne commented that he found the maps in the FAQs interesting and wondered if it was possible to see both heights and routes?

RM also asked if he could have a copy of the information showing the upper and lower levels of altitudes.

RW responded stating that in effect Reg was asking for a 3D map and at the moment this is not available.

Cllr. Brian Edmonds – Farnham Town Council asked how is suitable and sufficient insurance confirmed by the aerodrome? Brandon O'Reilly responded that it was the responsibility of the aircraft operator.

GM referred to the CAA's publication of diagrams of the South East airport controlled airspace curtilages at 2000 feet above sea level and beyond that level in 2000 foot steps. These diagrams are very simple, and therefore a helpful way of illustrating the volume of controlled airspace available for each airport, as well as the extent of the corridors of uncontrolled airspace available for use by the GA community. GM asked whether the diagrams could be updated to include Farnborough's controlled airspace

RW responded that this would not be available.

JL advised that she was going to write to the Association of Consultative Committees to complain about the FACC as she felt that the Committee were unable or not prepared to respond to her questions.

GM responded that in his experience many of the subjects raised by JL were for the attention of local Councillors and he agreed they were not always available for comment.

Jenny Radley asked if an update report about the Farnborough Airport Environment Fund could be brought to the next meeting and included as an annual item. It was important that people knew that this fund was available and how it was being used.

Maurice Sheehan informed the Meeting information on the Fund and the grants awarded, was already in the public domain and providing it to the Committee should not be a problem

All information relating to the Fund is available through publication of the RBC Cabinet Agenda and Minutes.

Action: The Secretary will liaise with RBC to establish the availability of the Report to the Committee.

GM asked ICCAN about their understanding of the CAA report with reference to his questions.

Howard Simmons confirmed he had received and read the observations from GM. He did not offer an answer.

Action: GM took responsibility and an action to draft a letter to go to the CAA and circulate it through the Secretary to the Committee.

James Radley made the observation that it had indeed been a monumental judgment today (referring to LHR third runway) and this will lead to a change in the way requests by airports for change and or expansion, will be considered by relevant bodies. Environmental changes had not been factored into the FAL approval for expansion. Operators of airports will need to address these issues thoroughly in future planning requests.

Item 8. Matters Raised by the Committee not on the Agenda

There were no further matters raised.

The Meeting was closed.

Item 9 Date of Committee Meetings in 2020

Thursday 18th June 2020

Thursday 29th October 2020

All meetings will take place at Rushmoor BC at 14:00 hrs.