



## **FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

Draft notes of the Meeting held at 2pm on Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> November 2005 in  
the BAE SYSTEMS Park Centre

### **Present:**

#### *Chairman*

Mr R. M. Mackay

#### *User Representatives:*

Mr. M. Khalek	GAMA Aviation
Mr. L. Rayment	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Sir Donald Spiers	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr. R Walker	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr. R. Broadhurst	ARAVCO
Mr J. Batty	Business Aircraft Users Association
Mr.W. Epton	RMC
Mr. C. Way	SBAC

#### *Local Authority Representatives*

Cllr. P. Hutcheson	Hart District Council
Cllr. N. Lambert	Hart District Council
Cllr. P. B. Isherwood	Waverley Borough Council
Cllr. P. Taylor	Rushmoor Borough Council
Cllr M. Drew	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Cllr. C. Pitt	Surrey County Council

#### *Local Interest Representatives*

Mr. G. Marks	Farnborough Airport Residents Association
Ms. J. Radley	Fleet and Crookham Civic Society
Cllr. E. Worrall	Ash Parish Council
Cllr. D. Attfield	Farnham Town Council
Ms. D. Knowles	Frimley Green and Deepcut Residents Association
Mr. R. Kimble	Farnborough College of Technology

*Secretary*

Mr. P. Riley

The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming Cllr Pitt who was attending for the first time as the representative of Surrey County Council. On behalf of the Committee he also expressed thanks to Mr. G. Green who had recently resigned as the Secretary to the Committee. He then welcomed Mr. P. Riley who had recently been appointed by TAG Farnborough as Committee Secretary. Mr Riley was asked to send a letter of thanks to Mr Green.

**[ACTION: MR RILEY]**

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr R. L. G. Dibbs (Rushmoor Borough Council), Cllr Mrs P. M. Devereux (Hampshire County Council) who had recently resigned from the Committee, Cllr Mrs M. Hunt (Waverley Borough Council), Cllr J. Phillips (Surrey County Council) who had resigned from the Committee, Ms D. Moss (Reserve for Fleet and Crookham Civic Society) and Cllr D. Argent (Crandall Parish Council).

**2. NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2005**

2.1 Accuracy

Mr Marks referred to item 2.2.2 which concerned a submission to Rushmoor on the subject of individual risk contours. A separate action had been placed on AEA Technology to report on their interpretation of the risk assessment. Sir Donald Spiers said that the information supplied to Rushmoor by AEA Technology was confidential but it was a matter for Rushmoor to decide whether to release it to the public. No amendments were proposed to the minutes which were then approved as a true record.

2.2 Matters arising

There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

**3. TAG INFORMATION REPORT (INCLUDING HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS)**

- 3.1 The Chairman invited comments on the TAG Information Report dated November 2005

- 3.2 Ms Radley commented that the number of weekend movements over the last 12 months already exceeded 2,500. Mr Rayment explained that the accounting year began on 1<sup>st</sup> January and that, although TAG was approaching the limit, it had not been exceeded for 2005. Ms Radley requested information on the percentage of movements on each runway. Mr Walker said that TAG now had that information and it would be included in the next report.
- 3.3 The Chairman said that a response had been given to all the complaints listed in the report. There were no comments on the list.

#### **4. TAG FARNBOROUGH AIRPORT LTD APPLICATION TO VARY CONDITION 11 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 99/00658/OUT**

- 4.1 In accordance with local government rules concerning planning applications, Cllr. Taylor left the meeting prior to the commencement of the discussion on this item.
- 4.2 The Chairman confirmed that the consultation period for the Application had been extended for a further 3 week period and would now expire on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2005.
- 4.3 Before taking questions on this item, the Chairman summarized the background to the development of Farnborough as a business aviation airport. In 1985 a Government White Paper on aviation had recognised the need to move business aviation out of Heathrow and Gatwick, giving priority to commercial air transport movements, and had stated that Farnborough would have an important role to play in the future as well as providing a site for the UK's premier airshow to continue. In 1989 the MOD disposed of a general aviation enclave on the south east side of the airfield on a long lease to the to Carrol Aircraft Corporation. During the first few years, flying activity was significantly less than the 25,000 movements permitted by the licence. In 1991, the MOD declared the aerodrome surplus to their requirements. With the local plan adopted in 1992 providing guidance on the form future developments at Farnborough might take, in 1993 Rushmoor Borough Council submitted a draft development guidance note to their planning committee, and for public consultation, proposing a maximum number of 40,000 movements with noise controls and weight restrictions. In 2000, following a public enquiry, planning permission was granted for a new enclave on the north side of the aerodrome with new hangars for storage and maintenance facilities plus a new control tower and administration/terminal building. A limit of 28,000 movements was stipulated with a weekend limit of 2,500 movements. After 15 years, during which time there had been substantial changes to the operating

environment at this long established aerodrome, Rushmoor Borough Council, on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2005, received an application from the operator, TAG Farnborough Airport Limited, to vary condition 11 of the existing planning permission (ref 1999/00658) by increasing the number of weekend and bank holiday movements from 2,500 to 5,000 per annum. Because of the importance and the obvious local interest in this change, the Council extended the consultation period from 3 weeks to six weeks and sent out some 8000 letters to local residents. The press were also informed of these actions. At the same time, TAG wrote to every member of the Committee and to others on the mailing list notifying them of the application. The Company arranged 3 public exhibitions in the Farnborough and Fleet areas to explain their application and they had also arranged an exhibition for members of the Committee prior to this meeting. It was important to remember that business movements commenced in 1989, 16 years ago, and therefore it was not surprising that many changes had taken place over the intervening period. However, operations at Heathrow would always dominate the flow of aircraft movements in the south east of England and the most recent White Paper on aviation, issued in December 2003, clearly set out the policy for the next 30 years. The question of weekend movements had been raised at a previous Consultative Committee meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2005 and the answer from TAG at that time had been that aircraft and operators had regularly been denied landing permission in accordance with the terms of the planning consent. The current application proposed a further change. The Committee had been fully briefed about the proposed variation to the existing consent; the new application would be considered by the Council in the near future. The Chairman then invited comments from Committee members.

- 4.4 Ms Knowles said that the main concern of her residents was that they had not received formal notification of the planning application from the local authority. This had caused considerable problems. Sir Donald Spiers responded by pointing out that it was not TAG's responsibility to notify residents – that was a matter for Rushmoor. Ms Knowles requested that Frimley and Deepcut should be included in any consultative process. Cllr Drew asked why TAG had not arranged an exhibition in Surrey Heath. The Chairman pointed out that the planning application was published on Rushmoor's website. Sir Donald Spiers reminded the Committee that TAG had arranged three exhibitions, two in Farnborough and one in Fleet. Cllr. Pitt said that there had been a lot of complaints from residents in Chobham and West End ; he suggested that they should also be consulted. Cllr. Worrall noted that he was still receiving complaints about aircraft noise and flying at weekends was an issue. He felt that there was an increased risk at weekends.

4.5 Cllr Lambert commented that the planning application could also be viewed on the FACC website and on the Surrey Heath and Rushmoor websites. Hart DC had not consulted with the public in its area. He added that Hart DC had requested the exhibition which took place in Fleet and he could not understand why the Surrey Heath or Frimley Green members had not also asked for an exhibition. Mr Marks emphasized that the role of the Committee was consultative and it was therefore necessary to ensure that all interested parties were given an opportunity to express views. If the application had been discussed before the application had been made to Rushmoor, members of the Committee could have given their advice. If necessary a special meeting of the Committee could have been convened. It was suggested that the Constitution of the Committee should be reviewed at the next meeting.

4.6 Sir Donald Spiers said that TAG had taken the decision to submit the planning application after the last meeting of the Committee. Members had been informed prior to the submission. Mr Batty said that his association strongly supported the application. He noted that business was re-locating to the Farnborough because of the availability of the airfield. For example, Nokia and Anhauser Busch had both moved into the area to take advantage of the business aviation facilities. Business users increasingly require the ability to use the airfield every day of the week including weekends.

4.7 Mr Marks said that the Environmental Statement included in the application was not a very satisfactory document. It contained many unsubstantiated statements. He recommended that the Council should examine it very carefully. Sir Donald Spiers said that Green Issues would complete their report after the deadline for comments. He saw no reason why the report should not be made public. Mr Broadhurst asked about the safety case. Mr Walker responded by confirming that the application covered all the safety and environmental issues.

Cllr Pitt asked about airfield opening hours and these were confirmed by Sir Donald Spiers who said that traffic overflying at 5 am was almost certainly associated with Heathrow. Mr Rayment said that no movements were permitted outside the hours stipulated in Condition 11 and aircraft were not allowed to circle until the airfield opened. Cllr Pitt asked if anything could be done to inform residents that aircraft operating late at night and early in the morning were not flying to and from Farnborough. Mr Walker said that TAG would be willing to show Members its track monitoring system.

- 4.8 Mr Marks said that the key issue was reduced amenity at weekends. The noise section in the Environmental Report had not been well prepared. The impact of additional flying at weekends is mainly felt in the summer months when residents are using their gardens. He produced two histograms detailing weekend movement patterns and requested that these should be circulated with the minutes. Cllr Attfield said that Farnham Town Council were concerned about the increase and did not wish to see additional commercial flying at the weekend.

## **5. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

- 5.1 Mr Whitcroft said that he acknowledged the contribution that TAG was making to the local economy. He also welcomed the efforts being made by TAG to reduce noise levels. However, he was less satisfied with the quality of the information which had been presented by TAG at the recent exhibitions. He regretted that no exhibition had been arranged in Mytchett which is an area that bears the brunt of overflying of aircraft landing at Farnborough. He questioned why demand for weekend flying had increased. Where was the demand coming from? No information had been provided on TAG's current profitability. The whole feel of TAG's application was arrogant. Residents cannot enjoy their gardens if aircraft are flying over at 150 – 200 ft.
- 5.2 Sir Donald Spiers said that aircraft approaching Farnborough overfly Mytchett at about 700ft. He regretted that Mr Whitcroft felt that TAG's attitude had been arrogant. TAG had made considerable efforts to inform the public before the closing date for comments and objections. In applying for an increase in weekend movements, TAG was responding to the requirements of its customers. Aircraft were being turned away every weekend and this was affecting TAG's business. Mr Rayment said that more aircraft were now based at Farnborough (there were now 40 based there) and this had also increased weekend demand.
- 5.3 A member of the public who had attended one of the exhibitions felt that it contained little information to support the planning application. There was a duty to notify the application to all parties affected by it. This included residents in Farnham and North Camp who had not received notification. Rushmoor BC had been advised of this omission. Rushmoor's response was that they had done all that that they are required to do. There was an obvious conflict between the business need and the affect on the amenity of local people – this

explained why Condition 11 had been included in the original planning consent. On the question of safety, there was, in the opinion of the speaker, an increased risk at weekends.

- 5.4 A member of the public was concerned about pollution. Mr Brothers asked whether in-bound aircraft were dumping fuel on approach. Mr Batty said that no aircraft using Farnborough had the capability to dump fuel. He also said that emissions from aircraft form a very small component of total air pollution.
- 5.5 Mr Venison (Ewshott) questioned why the Cabinet Office had visited Farnborough. Sir Donald Spiers explained that the visit was undertaken in connection with a Government review of the air transport arrangements for the Royal Household and senior ministers.

## **6. COMMITTEE'S WEBSITE**

- 6.1 Cllr Lambert said that details of the recent planning application had been put on the Committee's website. There had been a recent increase in the number of visits to the site – 191 in September, 469 in October and 291 in November (to date). Ms Radley said that she had been impressed with the website. In the introduction to the website mention was made of an airport development strategy and Ms Radley asked whether this could be made available to members of the Committee. Mr Rayment said that he would investigate the position and revert to Ms Radley.

**[ACTION : MR RAYMENT]**

7. Matters raised by Members of the Committee on Issues that are not on the Agenda
- 7.1 Cllr. Isherwood raised a question from one of his constituents. Could TAG give an indication of the expected growth in movements for the next five years? Sir Donald Spiers responded by saying that any increase would be dependent on economic growth trends. At present business aircraft movements for London and the South East were increasing at some 7% per annum. No step changes were anticipated at the present time. Cllr Isherwood commented that business users typically need to arrive at Farnborough on Saturdays and depart on Sundays – business was becoming more global and businesses now tended to operate on a seven day per week basis.

## **8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

- 8.1 The Committee agreed that its next meeting would be held on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2006 at 2.00pm. and the next following meeting would take place on Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> July 2006 at 2.00pm.

P. Riley

Secretary, Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee

20th November 2005