



FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Notes of the Meeting held at 2.pm. on Thursday 16th March 2006 in the
BAE SYSTEMS Park Centre

Present :

Chairman

Mr R. M. MacKay

User Representatives:

Mr L. Rayment	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr. R. Walker	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Sir Donald Spiers	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr J. Batty	Business Aircraft Users Association
Mr C. Way	SBAC

Local Authority Representatives:

Cllr M. Drew	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Cllr E. Worrall	Ash Parish Council
Cllr P. Hutcheson	Hampshire County Council
Cllr N. Lambert	Hart District Council
Cllr R. Dibbs	Rushmoor Borough Council
Cllr P. Taylor	Rushmoor Borough Council (part time)

Local Interests:

Mrs D. Knowles	Mytchett, Frimley Green and Deepcut Society
Mr G. Marks	Farnborough Airport Residents Association
Mrs J. Radley	Fleet and Crookham Civic Society

Secretary:

Mr P. Riley

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Mr M. Khalek, Mr J. Radley, Mrs M. Shepherd, Cllr Argent and Mr W. Epton.

2. NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17TH NOVEMBER 2005

2.1 Accuracy

In Item 4.4 Mrs Knowles asked for the reference to 'Frimley' to be changed to 'Frimley Green'. In Item 5.5 it was noted that 'Mr Venison' should read 'Mr Bennison'. Subject to these amendments the minutes were approved as a true record of the meeting.

2.2 Matters arising

In Item 6.1 Mr Walker said that changes had been made to the TAG website to tidy it up. There were no other matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. CONFIRMATION OF THE APPOINTMENT OF MR P. RILEY AS SECRETARY TO THE COMMITTEE.

3.1 The appointment of Mr P. Riley as Secretary of the Committee was confirmed.

4. TAG INFORMATION REPORT

4.1 The Chairman invited comments on the TAG Information Report for March 2006. Mr Marks noted that the INM Model does not comply with the relevant European Directive. Mrs Radley thanked TAG for including the table showing percentage of runway use. Mrs Knowles asked whether house numbers could be included in the Complaint Report. Mr Walker said there was no reason why this should not be done and it was agreed that Kathy Wood would follow up this request. Cllr Lambert commented that this could give rise to a Data Protection Act problem which should be investigated. Mrs Radley asked if the times of the complaints could be included in the report. This comment was noted by TAG. Mr Marks mentioned that his members send him copies of their complaints. Cllr Lambert thanked TAG for the promptness of their responses to complaints. Mrs Radley asked why the July 2005 complaints had been omitted from the November 2005 report. TAG responded that this was due to human oversight. Mrs Radley asked whether there was a proposal to construct a second large hangar. Sir Donald Spiers responded by saying that the original outline planning consent included a second hangar which would be built. However, TAG could not proceed without a detailed planning consent.

ACTION : TAG to consider changes to the Report

5. TAG FARNBOROUGH AIRPORT LIMITED - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPLIED TO RUSHMOOR BC IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPLICATION TO VARY CONDITION 11 OF THE PLANNING PERMISSION 99/00658/OUT

Cllr Dibbs of RBC left the meeting.

The Chairman confirmed that every Committee Member had received a copy of the letter that TAG had sent to RBC concerning this matter and that the 4 week consultation period on the revisions to the planning application ends on 17th March 2006. Until the officers report, following the consultation period, there was nothing to add. The Chairman invited comments from the Committee.

Cllr Lambert asked whether it was known when the revised application would be considered by the Planning Committee. The Chairman confirmed that no date had been set. More information may be required. A member asked whether the decision of the Council could be appealed. The reply was that an appeal could be made.

Mr Marks noted that the Application concentrates on Condition 11 of the original consent whereas the supporting statement covers numerous other issues. It was difficult for objectors to confine themselves to Condition 11 when the supporting document covers other areas. He questioned why Rushmoor Borough Council could not participate in the work of the Committee. Mr Marks also noted that the noise contour cap would form the main environmental constraint but this is not a practical limitation. Mr Walker said that it was inappropriate for TAG to comment on any aspect of the current application. Mr Marks asked the Committee to note that, on behalf of FARA, he had asked RBC to comment on the environmental statement but, after 4 months, they had still not responded.

Cllr Lambert said he was surprised that Hart District Council had only contacted one interested group (the Fleet and Crookham Civic Society). Could he assume that Hart DC have no objections to the Application? He said that some of the material that had been circulated in the area amounted to scare mongering. He warned that some of the information in the public domain was inaccurate and misleading. The Chairman said that the Committee would echo some of these comments.

Cllr Worrall said that the main issue for Ash PC was overhead noise. There was no suggestion that the airport was being used in an unsafe manner. However, noise was an issue for his residents and he wanted to see whether ways could be found to reduce noise nuisance.

6. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

In accordance with the Code of Conduct applicable to all councillors, Mr Taylor left the meeting because of the discussion concerning planning matters.

Reference was made to the letter sent by TAG to Rushmoor Borough Council, dated 9th February 2006 in which TAG described a number of measures to which it was willing to commit in order to allay public concerns. One of these

measures concerned a review of arrival and departure routes which might lead to a reduction in the over-flying of residential areas. A member of the public asked what TAG's proposals were in this regard. Mr Walker said that this was a matter which required discussion between the company and RBC. He offered to send the questioner a copy of the relevant pages of the Aeronautical Information Publication(AIP).Any changes to the AIP would require the consent of the CAA.

Ms M. Worrall of Ash asked why the Committee could not discuss noise issues at this meeting. The noise nuisance had become worse in recent times. Mr Walker responded by confirming that TAG were in discussion with RBC regarding this issue.

A member of the public said that when some aircraft take off to the north east they immediately turn right ; they should turn right further out over the Ranges. Issues such as this should be discussed by the Consultative Committee. TAG confirmed that they were open to suggestions on how the flight rules can be changed. Another question was raised concerning ground power units. Mr Walker confirmed that once the temporary buildings have been removed, following the completion of the new terminal building, there would be greater use of fixed GPUs to further reduce the noise from the apron.

Cllr Lambert suggested that the flight rules could be discussed at a future FACC meeting. The Chairman accepted this suggestion,which was also supported by Mr Marks. However, Mr Marks noted that there were very few options at Farnborough. He said that this issue should be reviewed by the Committee before it was discussed with RBC – this was one of the main purposes of the Committee.The Chairman reminded Members that they all had the opportunity, prior to any meeting, to submit questions to the Secretary for inclusion in the agenda. Sir Donald Spiers said that approach routes were more or less fixed under ILS rules. However, there was some flexibility on departure routes, especially on departures to the west.. TAG were willing to discuss this issue at an FACC meeting.

A member of the public asked whether a mitigation plan for flights required approval by the CAA. Mr Walker said that TAG would not approach the CAA with any procedure that was unsafe. In any event, the CAA must approve the rules under the terms of TAG's licence. Mr Marks noted that the relevant Act requires that the CAA should consult local interest groups on these matters. Mr Walker confirmed that the current procedures were first issued in 2003 when the CAA licence was granted.

TAG was asked whether it would close its business if the amendments to the planning application were rejected. Would it increase landing fees? Sir Donald Spiers said that TAG had not submitted a new application – it was attempting to answer questions raised by RBC and had incorporated certain proposals to mitigate their concerns. TAG was seeking amendments to the planning consent in order to respond to customer demand. TAG would consider its position when it received the Council's decision.

7. BRIEFING ON FARNBOROUGH INTERNATIONAL 2006

Mr Way of the SBAC gave a presentation on Farnborough International 2006. The show dates were 17th to 23rd July. Flying validation would be carried out the previous week. The SBAC were trying to make the show more interesting. The Trade Day on Monday would be more focused on industry. Tuesday to Thursday would also be trade days. Friday will be Youth Day - 1000+ 16 – 23 year olds had been invited in organised groups and special events would be arranged for them. These would promote the aerospace industry as attractive career opportunities. The two weekend days would be public days. There would be a business aircraft park and a space pavilion. The new Airbus A380 would appear at the show and give flight demonstrations. The Chairman asked if the new large aircraft would be undertaking validation flights prior to the show period. Mr Way said that such flights would take place. The show will take place every other year until at least 2012.

TAG were asked whether the CAA consent would permit the air show and whether an alternative threshold would be used. Mr Walker confirmed that the runway landing distance will be extended for specific aircraft only.

Cllrs Taylor and Worrall noted that FI2006 was an important local event and that if normal flight rules applied it might be difficult to hold the show at Farnborough.

8. WEBSITE

Cllr Lambert reported on the Committee's website. He said that the site was being well-used. The number of unique visits in recent months were 615 (November), 370 (December), 245 (January), 410 (February) and 122 (March – to date). The Chairman said that the website was much appreciated by the public and he thanked Cllr Lambert for managing it. Mrs Radley noted that the website could not be accessed from the Hart DC website.

9. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Mrs Radley asked for a breakdown of 'heavy' aircraft movements. Mr Walker replied that TAG had set out a table for the purposes of the planning consent. There were no restrictions on heavy aircraft movements at weekends. TAG could provide annual figures but not figures for each month. There had been 118 such movements in 2004 and 112 movements in 2005.

A question was raised concerning flight deviations. Mr Walker said that there were very few deviations. There had been only one deviation in February 2006. The information could be provided but this would only show that the numbers were very small. Most of the deviations were due to operations at RAF Odiham. No more than 2 flights per month were deviations. Most complaints related to aircraft which were not deviating from the rules. TAG

would review information on deviations over Fleet involving aircraft landing at Farnborough.

ACTION : Mr Walker

A definition of ‘Business Aviation’ was requested by Mrs Radley. Mr Rayment explained that business aviation at Farnborough includes corporate aircraft and aircraft chartered by individuals. In the S.106 Agreement, the type of aircraft use is defined by exception (ie. the type of aircraft operation that Farnborough is precluded from handling which includes aircraft used for ab initio training and commercial passenger and freight movements). Mr Batty said that the position was confusing. ICAO had just formulated a new definition and this can be accessed on www.icao.int. Another definition can be found on the IBAC website www.ibac.org. Mr Marks said that he had been discussing the definition with NATS. Apparently there were 3 or 4 definitions. The definitions are important because of crash rates.

10. Committee Constitution

The Secretary reminded the Committee that members appointed to the Committee served for a term of two years. It may be the case that some Committee members had served for longer periods. It was therefore agreed that the Secretary would write to each organisation represented on the Committee asking for confirmation of its nominee(s).

Cllr Lambert suggested that if organisations consistently failed to provide members, membership should be offered to a substitute organisation. The Chairman asked the Secretary to investigate this issue.

ACTION : The Secretary

Mr Marks proposed that a wider (geographic) group of authorities should be approached to see whether they wished to be represented on the Committee. The Chairman suggested that we look into the attendance question first before Mr Marks’ proposal is given further consideration.

Cllr Taylor remarked that in his view it was not appropriate to increase the size of the Committee – in that case it would become unwieldy.

Comments were made both by Members of the Committee and by members of the public that the layout of the meeting area resulted in some people finding it difficult to hear the proceedings. It was agreed that an alternative layout would be tried at the next meeting.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Committee will take place on 6th July 2006 and the next following meeting will take place on 16th November 2006.

P. Riley

Secretary – Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee

21st March 2006