



FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 23rd June 2022 Held Physically at RBC and Online with MS Teams.

In Attendance:

Philip Whittacre	Riley Hope	Chairman Secretary
Chris Norman	Dorn Lambert	Hart District Council Crandall Parish Council
Gareth Rod	Andrews Cooper	Farnborough Airport Ltd Hampshire County Council
James Les	Granger Freer	NATS Farnborough Airport Ltd
Brian Simon	Edmunds Geere	Farnham Town Council Farnborough Airport Ltd
Sarah Geoff	Kinsley Marks	Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut FARA
James Colin	Radley Gray	Hart District Council Fleet & Church Crookham Society
Gareth John	Saunders Ford	Church Crookham Parish Council Church Crookham Parish Council
Maurice Clarke	Sheehan Mouncher	Rushmoor Borough Council Gulfstream Aerospace Ltd.
Duncan Anne-Marie	Daines Barker	GAMA Aviation Woking Borough Council
John Duncan	Redpath Rae	Guildford Borough Council Dassault Aviation Group
Joanne Jules	Goodall Crossley	TAG Aviation Ltd Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth
Larry Helen	Magee Whitcroft	Farnborough College of Technology Surrey Heath Borough Council

Attendance: 43 Including the above.

Participation: 23 of the Members were represented.

This was the first hybrid meeting of the Committee. Unfortunately there were technical issues for members of the public logging on. Our sincere apologies for this. Members of the public were able to join by phone but it is understood this is not the same. Every effort will be made to avoid this next time.

Introduction

The Chairman welcomed the Committee to the first hybrid meeting of the FACC and reminded attendees that it would be recorded.

Item 1 Apologies Received:

Virginia Barrett	Farnborough College of Technology
Bob McShee	Guildford Borough Council
Ben Gleeson	Farnborough International
Jenny Radley	Fleet & Church Crookham Society
Bill Cole	Ash Parish Council
Paul Follows	Waverley Borough Council
Ian Dickson	NATS
Paul Taylor	Rushmoor Borough Council
Nigel Manning	Ash Parish Council
David Lewis	Surrey County Council
Marwan Khalek	GAMA Aviation

Item 2. Minutes of Meeting held on 21st October 2021 and Matters Arising.

The Minutes of this meeting, had been circulated to members.

Actions from the Meeting please see Appendix 1.

As of the time of writing, all Actions have been completed, thanks to all contributors.

Matters arising from the minutes:

As regards those Actions relation to the Public Safety Zone (PSZ) it was agreed that Richard Ward, RBC, and Geoff Marks, FARA would meet to discuss the points raised by Geoff Marks in his observations paper.

James Radley - Hart DC. Asked if someone from Hart DC Planning could also attend.

Action: Richard Ward to arrange meeting to discuss PSZ planning details.

The Chairman asked if there were any other comments or objections to the minutes and there were none raised. The minutes were therefore agreed by the Committee.

Item 3. Sustainable Aviation an Update – Dr Andy Jefferson - Director A&G Jefferson Ltd.

Andy Jefferson gave the Committee an insightful presentation into sustainable aviation, what it involves, what the key drivers behind it, what the government is doing in the space and how industry is developing to achieve net zero by 2050.

A number of Members asked questions and the Chairman thanked Andy for talking to the FACC.

The presentation and questions are in the webcast of the Meeting on the FACC website.

The Presentation will be circulated to Members and uploaded to the FACC website.

Item 4. Farnborough Airport Operational Update & Statement – Simon Geere.

Traffic - Activity levels continue to be strong at the airport with ATMs for May YTD up c128% on last year, which against 2019 was an increase of c15%.

The business aviation market as a whole is recording strong growth on the back of pent-up demand and continued disruption at commercial airports.

Farnborough Airport continues to be the largest business aviation airport in the UK with 34% of the market share, which has remained broadly stable.

Russian sanctions have meant we have one aircraft currently detained and parked on the south side of the airfield. The Russian/Belarus market is a very small market for FAL and the impact is quite negligible. Just to remind the FACC, the airport has a low concentration to any particular geographical market and serve over 800 international connections in any average year.

In May Farnborough Airport was again voted no 1 FBO in Europe for the 16th time in a row by Aviation International News.

Development - As the committee was informed previously, planning permission for the investment in the new Hangar 3 project was granted on 20th January 2022 by RBC.

Total project costs will be in the region of £50m over the next 2 years. This will be one of the single biggest investments in the borough for many years at a time when economic growth needs all the support it can get and will generate further employment opportunities as the airport grows.

In other developments supporting employment:

- Lichfield are progressing with the update of the Economic Impact Study which will be complete in Q3.
- Planning for the Airshow 2022 is ongoing.

Sustainability - Carbon Footprint for 2021 has been complete by consultants Ricardo. FAL will launch its Net Zero Road Map at the end of June where it will make commitments around reducing its controllable emissions. The UK is launching its Jet Zero Strategy at the Farnborough Airshow.

The first electric GPU, ground power unit, has come into service.

The fluorescent and halogen lighting in high bay positions in HANGAR 2 and the Ground Services Facility have been now been replaced with energy efficient LED light fittings.

FAL has commenced using HVO (Hydrotreated Vegetable Oil) as a replacement for the red diesel, phasing it in from the end of March 2022. 30 of airports vehicles are electric and 40 use HVO. This means 90% of the operational fleet are now electric or HVO. 5% of FAL employees have signed up for Electric car under the company's leasing scheme.

An internal audit of the Environmental Management System was completed in March 2022, this supports the FAL ISO 14001 certification.

People & Recruitment - Recruitment still very challenging. The airport has a significant number of vacancies across the organisation. In May FAL announced a one-off Recognition Payment to all airport employees.

FAL continues to progress with our apprenticeship scheme set up.

Aviator & Swan - Average occupancy for the Aviator YTD was c75%, which is ahead of expectations.

Questions arising from Simon Geere's report:

James Radley - A number of residents had commented that the movements over the Jubilee Weekend were higher than usual. Is this correct?

Simon Geere – Responded, movements were not materially higher over that weekend. SG indicated that weekend numbers were generally up with everything else.

Jules Crossley – BVFoE. Do the movement numbers reported by SG for weekend traffic mean FAL will hit its limits?

Gareth Saunders – Church Crookham PC. Made the same point.

Simon Geere - Responded, without mangling the numbers there would be a possibility of hitting the target. The airport is already actively managing the situation. Smaller aircraft are already choosing to go elsewhere.

Jules Crossley – Asked, with regard to Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, has FAL considered using solar panels for electricity?

Simon Geere - Responded, yes FAL undertook an evaluation of the benefits of solar panels against the costs/benefits of the carbon neutral electricity the airport already uses. [From the last meeting - All off site generated power is procured from Renewable Energy Guarantees of Origin (REGO) accredited suppliers.]

Jules Crossley – Asked, with regard to Scope 3 emissions, will this be a feature of the Ricardo Farnborough Airport Carbon Footprint Report?

Simon Geere – Responded, the Report will feature Scope 1, Scope 2 and Scope 3b emissions. Scope 3 emissions are generally considered outside the control of an operational airport as these are the emissions during the flight of the aircraft. Scope 3b are those flight emissions that are influenced by airport air traffic control. The Ricardo Report will feature Scope 3b emissions.

Rod Cooper – Hampshire County Council. Asked, Going back to aircraft movements what was the likely total this year?

Simon Geere – Responded, 35,000. (This is within the planning permission number of 50,000).

Rod Copper – Asked, Could FAL not offer a fixed ground electrical GPU?

Simon Geere – Responded, FAL already offer this facility.

Geoffrey Pierson – Member of the Public. Asked, asked what number of aircraft movements carry no passengers?

Simon Geere – Responded, FAL does not disclose this information.

Item 5. Farnborough Airport Reports – Gareth Andrews

The Reports provided to the Members ‘were taken as read’.

Questions – There were no questions.

Item 6. Airspace Change – Les Freer

Airspace Change – Post Implementation Review (PIR)

On 30th March, the FAL and CAA Teams had a call following receipt by FAL of the PIR scope

The change sponsor must provide the CAA with a PIR submission that includes data pre-requested by the CAA. This PIR data request form sets out that list of data required in order for the CAA to complete the PIR assessment. (For clarity the scope was discussed in terms of what the various data forms should look like, it wasn't to agree/disagree with content)

Scope was then confirmed by the CAA on the 31st March.

FAL contacted all of the FACC members on the 1st April to notify them of the process and a copy of the PIR scope was attached.

This outlined the next steps and outlined how we intended to notify the appropriate stakeholders.

Over the course of the next few weeks FAB contacted all of the original ACP PIR stakeholder and where there had been personnel changes these were identified and any new stakeholders were duly notified.

Stakeholder list included Borough Councils, Unitary Authorities, 88 MP's, 27 Operational Stakeholders: 26 Aviation partners: 27 NATMAC: 40 FAL Stakeholders: 2 Balloon Ops: 12 Environmental Groups, and 18 Airports: 18. A Total: 240 Stakeholders.

Additional Councillors were added following correspondence with Colin Shearn.

An E mail address was set up for stakeholders to send through any questions. Handful of questions sent to date.

The airport is currently gathering the data which will be submitted at the end of March 2023.

FAL is aware that some conversations have been had between Geoff Marks and the CAA and the CAA responses have been circulated.

CAA have asked FAL to read out the following; *The CAA are cognisant that the extant CAA Farnborough ACP webpage does not provide detail on the information and data required by the CAA from the Sponsor to satisfy completion of the PIR process. In addition, we will clarify exactly which air navigation guidance is applicable to this CAP725 ACP and that the process to be applied for this PIR, for transparency purposes, is in accordance with the information detailed in CAP1616*

and CAP1616 Appendix H. This information will be uploaded to the CAA Farnborough Airport ACP webpage in due course.

Having looked at the issues that are being raised there does seem to be a misunderstanding of the PIR process and the applicable noise requirements amongst some stakeholders. Les Freer will look at how FAL can seek to rectify this to provide stakeholders gain a greater understanding of noise and noise policy so that stakeholders are better placed to they are better to respond more effectively to the PIR.

For clarity, Les Freer sees this being part of FAL normal business as usual communications activity and not via subgroups.

Action: CAA website link to be added to FAL and FACC websites and circulated to Members.

Questions.

Colin Shearn – Farnborough Noise. The Farnborough Airport Airspace Change has had the effect of moving general aviation (GA) movements that formerly flew in Farnborough controlled airspace into other rural areas not previously over flown. As he understands it currently, the PIR will not include these new rural areas now overflown. Who should he speak t at the CAA to address this issue?

James Radley – Asked if it was possible to identify these newly overflown areas?

Wally Epton – WJE Associates. Pointed out the PIR can only make an assessment if previous data in these areas had been collected before the airspace change.

James Radley – Had heard anecdotally that Farnborough air traffic control (ACT) can be hard/rude to GA flights in its area. Is this true and will this be CAA be able to review the quality of ATC conduct?

Les Freer – Responded, NATS are looking at this.

James Granger – NATS. Responded, NATS take these comments seriously. Please provide evidence and NATS will look into any cases.

Airspace Modernisation Strategy (AMS) (Future Airspace Strategy ‘FASI’)

Les Freer talked to a Slide Deck which has been sent to Members and will be uploaded to the FACC website under Future Airspace Strategy.

Questions.

Rod Cooper. Supports the airport joining AMS.

Geoff Marks. Will CAP 1991 apply?

Les Freer. Responded, yes it will.

Geoff Marks, PIR is to be evaluated under CAP 1616; there is surely going to be a conflict between CAP 1991 and CAP 1616. How do stakeholders influence the CAA to apply the correct evaluation mechanism?

Les Freer. There is no conflict. PIR and AMS will run in parallel but these are separate programmes. The AMS will not come to fruition until 2025 to 2027 and any proposed changes would be subject to a separate PIR thereafter .

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

Colin Shearn. Referred to the point he made earlier, above, and made the point, stakeholders need to have the ability to engage with the CAA.

Gareth Saunders. Referred to a question he had asked FAL and NATS at a meeting he had had in October with them, saying he had not received an appropriate answer and when would he?

Les Freer and James Granger thought Ian Dickson had responded to Gareth Saunders, and would check with him.

Action: Les Freer and Ian Dickson – NATS to respond and close out Action.

Colin Shearn. As regards PIR start dates and data collection, stakeholders are confused, they want to lodge their concerns now but are holding back.

Les Freer. Over 260 stakeholders have been contacted with details of the process. If any want clarification, please contact his team who will help.

Stakeholders are not required to do anything until next March. In December, FAL will recontact all stakeholders and advise them when and how to submit comments.

Colin Shearn. How do stakeholders change the CAA method of review to include displaced GA as mentioned above and it needs to communicate how stakeholder responses will be submitted and recorded.

Richard Nobbs – Member of the Public. Is the FACC recommending to the CAA it widens the scope of PIR to include other rural areas impacted?

The Chairman suggested, subject to a vote of the Committee which supported this action, that a question be framed and sent to the CAA from the FACC.

Action: Draft and send letter to the CAA outlining the issues raised. This will ask the CAA if they would widen the scope of PIR to not previously overflowed areas and if the CAA would attend a meeting of the FACC to discuss PIR ?

Geoffrey Pierson. Asked, should the PIR mentioned earlier be used to log concerns/issues and if so will an acknowledgement be issued?

Les Freer. Everything will be logged/stored and sent to the CAA as per the process.

The Chairman. Suggested consolidating/storing everything received and submitting it as one, in March.

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

Jules Crosley. Raised the issue of creating a Climate Change Working Group, as a sub-committee of the FACC. I know this has been raised before and there were some concerns about a lack of expertise within the FACC, but FAL have very able sustainability officers who could support this and I feel the principal function of such a group would be to increase members knowledge and expertise in this area.

There was a discussion, James Radley, Simon Geere and Chris Dorn among others provided their views.

The Chairman asked the Members to show their support for the request with a show of hands.

It was decided not to proceed with the suggestion.

Les Freer. Provided an update of the Farnborough International Airshow.

Action: Les Freer to provide the Secretary with a schedule of road closures for circulation.

Item 9. Date of the Next Meeting.

The next meetings of the Committee will take place on:

Thursday 27th October 2022.

Medium/Location to be advised.

Please be advised proposed date for 2023 are:

Thursday 16th February, Thursday 22nd June and Thursday 26th October.

The Meeting was declared closed

Appendix 1.



FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ACTIONS UPDATE FROM MEETING HELD ON 24 February 2022

Action 1: Sarah Kinsley to forward LED Lighting research.

Noted below are links regarding the study conducted by the wildlife conservation organisation, Butterfly Conservation, and Newcastle University.

The key point is: "Field studies by the UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (UKCEH), Newcastle University and Butterfly Conservation found the abundance of moth caterpillars in hedgerows under LED street lamps was 52 per cent lower than in nearby unlit areas. This compared with a 41 per cent lower abundance in hedgerows lit by sodium lighting."

This basically means that LED lighting impacts an additional 11% on the reduction in insects – sadly a significant additional impact over sodium lighting. The severe impact on insect numbers caused by either types of lighting means we need lower lit areas where possible and as much lighting as possible switched off overnight, especially considering the airport's proximity to several SSSIs / SPAs (Thames Basin Heaths).

I would expect, due to the much higher levels of lighting utilised at the airport compared to the highways areas studied in this report, that the decline in the levels of insects surveyed around the airport would be much greater than the percentages stated in this report.

It would be interesting to know what the energy reduction is overall at the airport for LED compared to sodium.

Report: <https://www.ceh.ac.uk/press/LED-streetlights-reduce-insect-populations-50-percent>

Link to study article: <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abi8322>
Butterfly Conservation article: <https://butterfly-conservation.org/news-and-blog/streetlights-reduce-moth-populations>

SK June 2022.

Action 2: Richard Ward to produce an explanatory paper on PSZ.
Responses from Richard Ward and Geoff is separate emails..

Action 3: Richard Ward will set down the RBC PSZ Policy.
As in Action 2 above. The Secretary duplicated the action. Apologies.

Action 4: James Radley will provide details, if any, of the Hart DC PSZ Policy.
Response from Stephanie Baker, Development Management & Building Control Manager, Hart District Council.

‘The review of the PSZ from October 2021 looked to us to be a reduction with the PSZ no longer crossing into the administrative boundary of Hart. We considered that no changes to our policies or GIS mapping was required.

The relevant supporting information/maps can be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/control-of-development-in-airport-public-safety-zones/control-of-development-in-airport-public-safety-zones>

<https://www.rushmoor.gov.uk/article/2563/Public-Safety-Zones>

<https://www.rushmoor.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21954&p=0> ‘

Action 5: Richard Ward will follow up with the CAA and circulate any appropriate response.
Please see attached.

Action 6: FAL to supply PSZ Safety Report.
Hyper-Link provided in Minutes.

Action 7: FAL to supply a layman’s Overview of the PIR process over the next 12 months.
Issued directly by L Freer - 1 April 2022.

Action 8: FAL and NATS to supply a summary of the meeting with the CAA.
Email from L Freer - 1 April 2022 attaching above summary.

Action 9: Secretary to circulate sections of CAA document to FACC Members.
Circulated with Minutes.

Action10: Ian Dickson NATS to review and respond to Question from H Sheppard.
Circulated with Minutes.

Action 11: FAL and NATS to supply a response to question from Mr Partridge.
Circulated with Minutes.

Action 12: ***NATS to supply a response to question from Mr Nobbs.***

Member of the Public had noted that Ian Dickson had earlier said that he considered the Air Navigation Guidance requiring aircraft to keep an altitude of over 7,000 ft when overflying AONB to refer to GA. However, my reading of the guidance was that it refers to airspace routes, which does not narrow it down to GA. Mr Nobbs asked for a fuller explanation in writing of why there is an apparent conflict between the routes currently flown and this guidance.

I have taken advice from members of the team who were involved with the design of the SID and STAR routes, who have advised that-

It is clear from the detail supplied to me, that when designing the Farnborough Airport ACP, the CAA was aware of the potential issues/impact overflying AONB.

The CAA's Air Navigation Guidance (2017) clearly indicates guidance in respect of overflying AONB should be applied 'where practical'.

Due to the proximity of Heathrow and Gatwick, and the location of the Surry Hills AONB, it was not practical to design routes that avoided the area below 7000ft, however the CAA remarked in their CAP1678 (Farnborough ACP) that, 'with regard to AONBs and National Parks the impact will be no worse than currently experienced, with the potential to improve if aircraft achieve improved vertical profiles'.

As I have said before, the vast majority of flights the arrive/depart to/from FAB do so under Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and as such, operate on Standard Departure and Arrival routes (SIDs and STARs).

These SIDs and STARs are pre-determined (this was done by CAA during the ACP as mentioned above) routes that are only varied for the observance of safety and/or aircraft integration, therefore will be flown with a great degree of accuracy for the vast majority of the time.

FAL ATC has a responsibility to ensure that aircraft remain within Controlled Airspace (CAS) at all times during the departure and arrival phases of flight. By keeping aircraft within CAS, terrain safety is also ensured (1000ft above the nearest fixed obstacle within 25nm). Whenever ATC vary a route from a SID or STAR, there is no requirement to ensure AONBs are avoided regardless of the height the aircraft is operating at.

In response to the question NATS and FAL ATC are following CAA guidelines in respect of SID's and STAR's as is clear from above, this operational guidance is sometimes at variance to the CAA's own guidance relating to AONB.

Actions – Responses

Action 2 and 3. Richard Ward to produce an explanatory paper on PSZ.

Briefing paper from Richard Ward provided in separate email.

Action 5: Richard Ward will follow up with the CAA and circulate any appropriate response.

Email from RBC to CAA.

From: Richard Ward

Sent: 18 May 2022 11:03

To: 'FS Technical Support Team

Subject: Public Safety Zone Consultation

Good Morning

I am writing on behalf of Rushmoor Borough Council to request further information as to when a Consultation Response document may be made officially available pertaining to the Public Safety Zone consultation that closed on 23 December 2020.

The Policy Paper 'Control of development in airport public safety zones, updated in October 2021, has been the subject of significant concern for some members of the Farnborough Airport Consultative Committee. In particular, there has been some confusion as to the reasoning behind and methodology employed in developing the new standardised zones. This has led to some concerns amongst members that safety has not been adequately addressed and it would be reassuring if some clarity on this could be provided as soon as possible.

In addition, as part of Rushmoor Borough Council's response to the consultation, we requested further guidance on how third party risk should be considered when an application is made for further development at an existing airport. It is hoped that this will be covered within any upcoming consultation response document. However, if this specific enquiry has not been addressed within the response I would be grateful if you could provide some comment on the likelihood that further guidance on this will be forthcoming.

Kind regards

Richard Ward
Environment & Airport Monitoring Officer
Operational Services
Rushmoor Borough Council

CAA Auto-Response

From: donotreply@caa.co.uk <donotreply@caa.co.uk>

Sent: 18 May 2022 11:03

To: Richard Ward

Subject: Thank you for your email

Thank you for your enquiry to the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). We aim to respond as soon as possible. In some cases, we will need to seek specialist advice or forward your enquiry onto the most relevant area of the CAA to respond to you directly. This can sometimes take up to 20 working days.

Action 8: FAL and NATS to supply a summary of the meeting with the CAA.

31 March 2022.

Dear FACC Members

We received confirmation from the CAA yesterday as to the scope & data requirements that the airport will be required to provide as part of the CAA's Airspace Change Post Implementation Review (PIR) process and we will shortly start the process of notifying all of the original stakeholders (from the initial consultation) along with other relevant parties to share this information with them. As previously communicated the process of data collection starts from the 1st April and runs for 12 months.

For your information I have attached a copy of the letter that will be going out to all stakeholders during the course of next week, were possible we will personalise the letters based on the records that we have.

If anyone would like any further information and /or clarification at this stage then my contact details are below.

Regards

LF

Les Freer

Airport Operations Director