



FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

“keeping people informed”

FACC Meeting 18 February 2021 – Farnborough Airport Ltd. Answers to Questions.

Cllr James Radley

Q1. Residents in Hart have been complaining to local members about engine test noise, presumably associated with the Gulfstream Maintenance facility. May I ask if Rushmoor BC can remind the committee what planning conditions are in place to limit the noise annoyance resulting from engine testing?

RBC confirmed S106 restrictions – 08:00 to 20:00 Monday to Friday. Essential running permitted at weekends / bank holidays on same timings. All High Power runs to take place a Zulu. Low power runs permitted at aprons. All subject to ATC approval

Q2. The phone based complaints messaging service is seen to be a little foreboding for some. Would FAL consider allowing residents who have a noise complaint (or any other complaint or question relating to operations at the aerodrome) to be able to register their complaint through an on-line form?

The following link is available n the FAL website and provides access to an on-line complaint reporting system - <https://webtrak.emsbk.com/fab>

Q3. Do FAL have a mechanism for passing noise complaints on to Gulfstream as appropriate?

Complaints are handled by FAL, liaison with Gulfstream is undertaken if FAL investigations identify a need.

Hugh Sheppard

1. Please would the FACC establish if Farnborough Airport Ltd. has responsibility for passenger and crew registration re. the purpose of travel and any related liability to quarantine?

No, this is the responsibility of individuals, operators and UK Border Force

a) If the answer is ‘Yes’; could the meeting be advised as to the reporting procedures and the extent to which such information would be in the public domain?

N/A

b) If the answer is ‘No’; can we be advised who has the reporting responsibility, including any self-reporting, and whether the airport has a monitoring role for compliance?

Individuals, operators and UK Border Force. FAL has no monitoring role for compliance.

2. (Possible follow-up) Should FAL consider this is a personal, private or 3rd party matter, can we be advised of the relevant legislation or guidance relied upon for such advice?

Requirements for travel are available on online.

[Coronavirus \(COVID-19\): safer travel guidance for passengers - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/safer-travel-guidance-for-passengers)

Geoff Marks

Are FAL now able to:

- a. Confirm that the data the CAA will require to support its PIR has been agreed?

The FAL ACP became effective on the 27th Feb 2020. Whilst the change proposal was progressed in accordance with CAP 725, the CAA requested sponsors follow the PIR requirements outlined within CAP 1616 so as to ensure that the exercise meets the latest standards. The outputs of the PIR will seek to demonstrate compliance with these requirements on behalf of FAL.

The PIR is an assessment of whether the anticipated impacts and benefits in the original ACP proposal and published decision are as expected, and where there are any differences, what steps (if any) the CAA requires to be taken.

Due to the high interest from the surrounding GA community and the complexity the CAA have requested two sets of data from FAL for 6 and 12 months. FAL and NATS aim to submit a test package of data to the CAA after the first month.

NATS will provide analysis and documentation detailing the required metric outputs, demonstrating the impact of the change and relating that back to the original claims in the ACP. The analysis produce is based on the requirements in Table H1 of CAP 1616 which covers safety, service and environmental metrics which will be referred in the PIR. There is also some additional analysis being included relating to Class G VFR traffic patterns in some areas (details can be provided).

A meeting was held on Friday 5th Feb 2021 with the CAA, Lasham and Southdown Gliding Societies and Farnborough to discuss the proposed start date of the ACP.

Due to the subdued air traffic experienced by each stakeholder, and also the neighbouring London TMA Airports, the decision was made to delay the PIR, with an expected start date of October 2021. The CAA webpage detailing the Farnborough ACP is expected to be amended in the near future.

Following agreement with the CAA at the above meeting it was agreed to further postpone the start of the FAL PIR until the 1st October 2021, this is solely down to the continual atypical ATM movements caused by the ongoing situation with COVID-19. The CAA have confirmed that this is the approach they are taking across all ACP within the UK currently.

- b. Define 'overflown'. Is it populations within swathes or flown directly overhead on a given number of occasions in any one day?

Ian Dickson (Manager ATC, NATS) has asked the CAA to provide a definition on this term, we are awaiting an answer.

- c. Identify the areas and the populations that are no longer overflown, and those that are newly overflown, by Farnborough traffic at heights below 4000 feet.?

During the ACP consultation heat maps were produced and published to identify the tracks of aircraft. This process will again be completed during the PIR, which will then be able to better inform us of the populations that are either no longer or newly overflown.

Both Rushmoor and FAL have responded to a CAA consultation on proposed changes to the Public Safety Zone Circular.

The size of Public Safety Zones (PSZ) are currently based on modelled annual individual risk, and therefore can increase in size as predicted air traffic movements increase. The proposed change would see the replacement of Farnborough's current PSZs by much smaller zones that are fixed in size .

Fixed zones are being proposed because NATS has confirmed it will cease providing its risk modelling service. But the government's tolerability thresholds for third party risk, and upon which the Local Plan risk policies are based, will continue to remain in force.

Rushmoor and FAL are asked to brief the FACC on their responses to the consultation, and in particular, whether the potential impact of the proposed change upon the Local Plan policies have been recognised and raised with the S of S for Housing Communities and Local Government.

FAL's response welcomed the removal of PSZ review period the reduction in administration to support it. No comment was made on the impact from a planning perspective as this sits within the domain of the local authority. A response from the CAA on the consultation is awaited.

The attached is the governments 'COVID -19' guidance for General Aviation. It comes into force tomorrow, 15 Feb. The following are key points:

- Farnborough is one of only 5 approved entry points. The others being Heathrow, Gatwick, Birmingham and London City.
- For General Aviation (GA) the national lockdown rules apply. The law requires everyone to stay at home except for work and other specified purposes. GA leisure flying is not permitted ie no DERA aero club flying. The permitted 'work' exemptions are professional pilots undertaking flying training, which is anyway precluded by the planning permission, and maintenance checking flights.
- The Guidance then refers to a category of GA, International GA, that must comply with the international travel rules. Unlike FAL's planning permission, the guidance does not draw a distinction between business and holiday air travel.

I assume that FAL will outline the steps it has had to take in order to comply with this guidance. In particular, members may find it helpful if FAL can say whether the planning condition that precludes holiday makers returning by air to the UK via Farnborough airport has been temporarily set aside.

- Red-list hotel quarantine came into effect on 15th Feb
- FAL is one of 5 entry ports for applicable passengers
- FAL is working in close co-operation with DHSC, Border Force and DFT
- FAL has no role in the enforcement of new arrangements, this is the responsibility of Border Force and police
- FAL's planning permission DOES NOT preclude holiday air travel
- 'Including tour' charter flying is restricted under planning, this is where commercial flights are sold as a package 'including' hotel accommodation etc, typically by Tour Operators selling charter holidays
- FAL does not accept these flights and therefore no planning condition has been temporarily set aside
- All holiday air travel is prohibited under current UK rules and enforcement is undertaken by Border Force and police

Colin Shearn

- 1) The TAG/Farnborough consultation was supposed to consider the impact of GA resulting in changes to flightpaths. The question below that is included in the "Airspace Change and Flight Paths at Farnborough Airport Frequently Asked Questions" is incorrect and incomplete.

7. How will 'non-Farnborough' aircraft be affected?

Other airspace users will still operate through the new controlled airspace set-up but must now communicate with Air Traffic Control to do so; this is so aircraft movements can be co-ordinated to ensure safe separation and consistent departure and arrival paths at Farnborough Airport.

A 'settling-in' phase is anticipated over the coming months as other airspace users become accustomed to the new airspace structure. This could result in non-Farnborough aircraft operating more intensively over areas on the periphery of the controlled airspace, however it is expected that this will reduce over time as passage through controlled airspace becomes more typical.

GA is having to fly much lower than it did in the past to keep below the new flight paths and allow sufficient vertical separation. This means that GA is now flying at 500 – 1,500ft in the surrounding areas which is considerably lower than it did in the past.

How will the noise and disruption from GA resulting from the Farnborough Airport flight paths be included in the PIR?

Noise monitoring did not form a part of the approved ACP process and will not form a part of the associated Post Implementation Review (PIR). However, it should be noted that the controlled airspace and associated procedures are designed to afford GA access to operate within and to be able to cross controlled airspace. The PIR will ensure that this 'fair and equitable' access is provided, which will mitigate the need to GA flight to operate below the base of the airspace.

- 2) The noise monitoring stations at each end of the runway do not provide a realistic measurement of the disturbance caused by aircraft arriving and departing from Farnborough. Background daytime noise at the ends of the runway is about 50-55dB. Aircraft are creating about 60-65dB when taking off – a difference of 5-15dB. When aircraft are flying over nearby rural areas the daytime background noise is 30-40dB with passing aircraft creating about 50-55dB. A difference of 10-25dB. This is therefore much more noticeable and therefore causes more disturbance in rural areas. Will noise monitoring in rural areas surrounding the new flightpaths be included as part of the PIR?

The noise monitoring stations located at each end of the runway have the primary role of collecting actual noise data from departing and arriving movements, used to validate the periodic noise modelling assessments that are undertaken in accordance with relevant clauses of the Section 106 Agreement.

While data from the stations is required to be submitted to RBC (detailed with the 2 Environment Reports submitted annually), there are no planning restriction limits set for the noise of individual movements.

Additional noise monitoring and modelling did not form a part of the approved ACP process and will not form a part of the associated Post Implementation Review (PIR).