



---

## FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 18<sup>th</sup> February 2021 Held Online with MS Teams.

#### In Attendance:

Philip	Riley	Chairman
Whittacre	Hope	Secretary
Chris	Axam	Hart District Council
Brian	Edmunds	Farnham Town Council
Virginia	Barratt	Farnborough College of Technology
Bill	Cole	Ash Parish Council
Ian	Dickson	NATS
Les	Freer	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Paul	Follows	Waverley Borough Council
Ben	Gleeson	Farnborough International
Simon	Geere	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Christina	Harris	Church Crookham Parish Council
Josephine	Hawkins	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Norman	Lambert	Crondall Parish Council
Geoff	Marks	FARA
Charlotte	Morley	Surrey County Council
James	Radley	Hart District Council
Jenny	Radley	Fleet & Church Crookham Society
Gareth	Saunders	Church Crookham Parish Council
Maurice	Sheehan	Rushmoor Borough Council
Paul	Taylor	Rushmoor Borough Council
Miles	Thomas	Farnborough Airport Ltd
John	Tonks	Ash Parish Council
Wally	Epton	WJE Associates

#### Guest

Anne- Marie	Barker	Woking Borough Council
-------------	--------	------------------------

**Attendance: 52 Including the above.**

## **Introduction**

The Chairman welcomed the Committee to the second online meeting of the FACC and the first open to the public and made the following comments.

The Chairman welcomed Cllr Ann-Marie Barker of Woking BC as an observer. The FACC had received a request from WBC to join the Committee. The Chairman mentioned that later in the meeting he would be proposing to review the Constitution and Membership of the Committee so a decision on WBC's membership would be deferred until the review has been completed and any changes approved by the Committee.

The Chairman proceeded to read out a list of instructions for the participants regarding etiquette and use of Teams.

The Chairman then reminded all attendees that recording of the meeting was about to start. If members did not want to be filmed for the recording to be uploaded to the FACC website they should make this known now.

The Chairman asked the Secretary to summarise a note and responses received, previously circulated regarding the process and procedures around question. Please see attached.

### **Item 1 Apologies Received:**

Ross McNally Hampshire Chamber of Commerce

### **Item 2. Minutes of Meeting held on 29th October 2020 and Matters Arising**

The Minutes of the last meeting were approved as circulated.

Actions from last Meeting:

1. Action: The Secretary to ask, if, once published, RBC would present the Report of the Farnborough Airport Community Environmental Fund to the FACC.
2. Action: Miles Thomas took an action to provide a key to explain the various responses to the Complaints List and review the chart detailing waste management processes for the next meeting.
3. Action: The Chairman took an action to draft and circulate a note on the subject of the FACC Committee Membership.
4. Action: The Secretary took an action to ask the Committee for comments regarding the FACC Constitution, which will be reviewed and put forward for consideration.

All actions were completed; a summary is attached.

Matters arising: There were no matters arising.

### **Item 3. Farnborough Airport Community Environment Fund – Alison Nicholls - RBC.**

It was planned that Alison would give the meeting a presentation on this subject.

However, the time taken to work through other items on the agenda, meant there was not enough time to give this presentation. Alison has kindly agreed to do so at the next meeting in June.

#### **Item 4. Farnborough Airport Operational Update – Simon Geere.**

##### **Overview**

SG wanted to provide some additional context to his update.

The operational business of FAL, is much more than an airport. FAL owns the Aviator Hampshire Hotel and the Swan Public House which are in the hospitality sector.

The greater site is also the home to many outstanding companies in their own right, including Farnborough International and the MRO operations of Gulfstream and Dassault. This is in addition to the multitude of operators, brokers and ancillary companies that choose to locate themselves in Farnborough.

Nearly half of the Company's direct workforce of over 300 staff members are employed in the hotel and hospitality sector. Pilots and crew comprise nearly a third of all stays at the hotel, with corporate bookings and meeting/events making up the majority of the rest. Further, many of the hotels in the area benefit from being in close proximity to the airport.

As such, all these businesses, and many businesses situated in the local and regional area, are interconnected and mutually reliant upon one another.

COVID has obviously had a massive impact on both the airport and aviation, but also on the hospitality sector as well as the exhibition and conference industry.

Consequently, the business has had a difficult year and yet, despite this, Farnborough Airport has demonstrated itself to be more resilient than many other commercial passenger airports.

During these challenging times, FAL has been unwavering in its priorities:

- First and foremost, the safety and wellbeing of its employees, customers and business partners. FAL has rigidly followed all government guidelines in this regard and in spite of a limited number of isolations and COVID cases, FAL has maintained the continuity of its operation.
- Secondly, the protection of jobs, employment and livelihoods. FAL has not made a single redundancy due to COVID. Many other UK airports and hotels have experienced significant job losses.
- Thirdly, through continuity of operation, FAL has been able to continue to support business aviation and UK connectivity throughout the pandemic. This has included the

handling of medical flights to support the logistics of transporting patients to/from available care and treatment.

- Finally, FAL continue to prioritise where it can support of the local community. One such example was opening the Swan pub during October half-term to provide free meals, supplied and prepared at the Aviator Hotel, to disadvantaged local school children and their families.

### **Operational Performance - 2020**

In terms of operational performance data for 2020, the headlines are as follows:

- Air Traffic Movements (ATMs) were down c -40% against 2019 due to the impact of COVID on travel demand
- Occupancy at the Aviator Hotel averaged only c 40% across the year, down from c 70%
- The Swan pub has been closed since the beginning of December 2020

Other points of note:

- FAL has used furlough arrangements during Lockdowns 1 and 2 and, mainly at the Aviator and Swan, during Lockdown 3
- However, it continues not to take up its full eligibility to various other grants that have been available, especially in the hospitality sector; and
- FAL has increased its employee base especially in the area of safety & compliance and is further resourcing our sustainability efforts

### **Operational performance - 2021**

It was the first year anniversary of the purchase of the airport by Macquarie at end October 2020. The support of the shareholder and board during this challenging time has been steadfast, as has been the support of Rushmoor BC and the wider employee community.

Moving into the New Year FAL entered Lockdown 3 on 4 January 2021 and traffic performance in January is down significantly with hotel occupancy also down materially. The Swan pub unfortunately still remains closed.

February looks like it will follow a similar pattern, FAL is hoping for a recovery subject to the relaxation of government restrictions. FAL continues to be incredibly proud of all its colleagues across the business as they grapple with the prevailing uncertainty.

Societal goals remain unchanged, with focus on being:

- An employer of choice, opportunity and growth
- A global sustainability showcase for airports
- Industry-leading safety and compliance execution

### **Covid-19 Specific Measures:**

All government guidelines have been followed. For the Committee's information, the following measures were implemented to maintain operational integrity during the period:

- Information and updates across the airport
- Social distancing of 2 metres where possible
- Where social distancing was not possible masks were mandated
- Hand sanitisers introduced throughout the airport complex
- Mandatory requirement to wear masks throughout the terminal
- Home-working supported where practical

### **Red-list Designation**

More recently, the government announced that Farnborough Airport was one of a number of airports designated by UK government to process arriving passengers whom have visited, or transited through, red list countries within 10 days of their arrival into the UK. Key points:

- These are only passengers arriving into the UK on business aviation flights
- UK government has advised that there is no increased risk to employees or passengers
- All existing COVID preventative measures continue to be adhered to
- There are no direct flights allowed from red list countries, this relates to arrivals on indirect flights
- FAL already accepts these flights and as such nothing has changed, except that now they are working with government agencies to facilitate the processing of such arrivals in accordance with the new hotel quarantine requirements.
- No such passengers have so far arrived through FAL
- FAL is proud to be playing its part in supporting the UK Government and business aviation in these difficult times.

### **Questions**

James Radley - Hart DC asked why/how did FAL achieve Red-List Designation?

SG answered he did not know. FAL is easy to keep isolated, it is close to the quarantine hotels RAF Northolt has restricted hours. Any of these reasons could have been a factor.

### **Item 5. Farnborough Airport Reports – Miles Thomas**

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

Jenny Radley - Fleet & Church Crookham Society, thanked MT for the changes to the reports.

MT commented the Complaints Report was distorted/dominated by one complainant who had made hundreds of complaints in the reported period.

MT said the complaints (originally commencing in July 2020) followed the same theme. FAL had provided detailed responses to the complainant including information on operational performance, environmental performance and planning obligation compliance. As a result of the persistent approach, FAL's response was limited to acknowledgement of the complaints only from late August, in accordance with the Complaints Procedure Charter.

Geoff Marks – FARA asked if FAL had tried to talk or meet the complainant?

MT confirmed he had done this - due process had been followed per the Charter. FAL had offered to meet but the complainant had said they would prefer to do this once lockdown was over.

GM asked if it would be an idea for a local councillor to contact the complainant.

Paul Follows - Waverley Borough Council, offered to make contact.

**Item 6.     **Airspace Change Process (ACP) Update– Les Freer.****

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 produced is based on the requirements in Table H1 of CAP 1616 which covers safety, service and environmental metrics which will be referred to 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.

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. The CAA webpage detailing the Farnborough ACP is expected to be amended in the near future.

The CAA has confirmed that this is the approach they are taking across all ACP within the UK currently.

Some members of the public asked if the acronyms could be explained and made clearer next time.

Paul Follows asked if FAL could provide an explanation of Airspace Change Process (ACP) and Post Implementation Review (PIR).

Miles Thomas pointed out there are explanatory documents on both the FAL and FACC websites.

**Action: Les Freer took an action to review the material on the websites to ensure it is clear and up to date.**

#### **Item 7. FACC Constitution & Membership Review – The Chairman.**

The FACC held its first meeting in March 2003, since then the constitution had been reviewed against DfT guidance periodically. The Chairman felt the proposal from James Radley to do so again was a good one. He asked the Committee if they agreed and wished to proceed with a review. There was a positive response.

He proposed the formation of a sub-committee to include 1 or 2 representatives from each of the 3 interest groups to sit on the sub-committee to review and make recommendations to the next meeting in June.

He made the points that the size of the FACC should not be increased (refer to LGW and STN committees) and the principle of having a balance between the 3 interest groups should be maintained.

Reference should be made to guidance and guidelines for Airport Consultative Committees from the DfT and the liaison group for consultative committees, the UKACC.

There was a general conversation with members regarding the number of members, whether members should have more than one seat, whether the FAL and Gulfstream should be members whether communities within different noise zones should be represented, whether there should be representation supporting the issues of climate change.

The Chairman asked for volunteers to form the review group; these were:

Local Interests: Geoff Marks, Gareth Saunders, Norman Lambert, Brian Edmonds, Jenny Radley.  
Local Authorities: James Radley.

Users: Les Freer

**Action: James Radley took an action to pull the group together, nominate a Chairman and bring recommendations back to the next Meeting.**

#### **Item 8 - Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public.**

SG asked if he could make the following observations: FAL want to be transparent with all stakeholder groups and would answer all questions relevant to the operation of the airport, where in the opinion of FAL commercial or confidential sensitivities were not compromised . He does not want a 'cottage industry' developing asking questions which cannot be answered satisfactorily for the lack of data, commercial sensitivity or confidentiality.

**Questions from James Radley - Hart DC** – Questions and answer attached.

**Question 1 from Geoff Marks – FARA** - Questions and answer attached.

GM felt the 51dB contour would be the best way to identify overflowed areas of population.

MT said the 51dB contour had never been used so it would not be an appropriate comparator.

MT went on to say, PIR did not require noise contour modelling.

GM said he would like to understand this better.

MT and LF agreed to take the discussion with GM off-line.

**Question 2 from Geoff Marks – FARA** - Questions and answer attached.

**Question 3 from Geoff Marks – FARA** - Questions and answer attached.

**Question from Hugh Sheppard - CPRE Hampshire** - Questions and answer attached.

HS asked whether flights for holidays/leisure were recorded?

Simon Geere responded that this information was not captured. This definition applies to commercial aviation in the context of travel and 'package holidays' but is not recognised in business aviation.

Wally Epton – WJE Associates -confirmed this.

**Question from – Mike Grant** – on behalf of an alliance of environmental groups made up of **XR FFC (Fleet, Farnborough and Camberley), XR Farnham, XR Godalming, Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth and North Camp Support Group.** - Questions and answer attached.

The Chairman asked the Members to express a view regarding environmental emergency.

James Radley and Paul Follows responded for the Committee stating the FACC would follow international, national and local governments in recognising a climate state of emergency.

Discussion ensued.

Mike Grant said he and his colleagues were concerned about the global levels of private jet operation. He did not want to see the airport closed or see the loss of local jobs as a consequence. He was however concerned at the speed with which FACC responded to questions and their completeness stating he only wanted to get the truth.

Simon Geere said the solution was not just with FAL it fell on the users, operators, manufacturers, fuels suppliers and others.

Mike Grant said any solution was required urgently. stating we only have 8 years left to save the planet.

Gareth Saunders asked MG if he accepted business aviation contributes only 0.04% of total global CO2 emissions?

Mike Grant accepted this point.



Discussion ensued.

**Action: FAL took an action to respond to those questions they can answer and provide reasons for those to which they cannot respond by Friday 19th February 2021.**

**Action: Mike Grant took an action to propose what the FACC could be doing to make a contribution to the Climate Emergency to be considered at the June Meeting.**

**Question from Julia Longrigg - Greater Rushmoor Against War - Questions attached.**

The Chairman said he does not accept the Exhibition Centre activities are part of airport operations so it is not appropriate for the FACC to respond.

Ben Gleeson – Farnborough International – agreed to answer the questions off-line.

**Question from Colin Shearn - Questions and answer attached.**

These questions were received the day before the meeting and after the cut-off date, 11<sup>th</sup> February. FAL responded to the request and the answer is attached.

**Question from Mr C Elithon.**

What measures will be put in place to monitor noise after ACP/PIR?

Miles Thomas responded that the Section 106 details routine noise monitoring requirements to which FAL complies. 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).

Geoff Marks asked how FAL will comply with PIR modelling and whether two monitoring points enough?

Miles Thomas answered no noise modelling is required under PIR.

Chris Axam asked if Geoff Mark could suggest what noise modelling he would recommend?

**Action: Geoff Marks took an action to provide some thoughts on noise metrics.**

**Item 9. Matters Raised by the Committee not on the Agenda.**

There were no matters raised by the Committee not on the Agenda.

The Chairman referred back to the review of the Constitution above and advised that matters such as the noise monitoring just discussed may benefit from a Technical Advisor. He had noted some other consultative committees now have these. There would of course be a matter of cost.

The Meeting was declared closed.

**Item 10 Date of Committee Meetings in 2021**

**Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> June and Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> October.**



## **ACTIONS FROM MEETING HELD ON 18<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2021**

1. **Action: Les Freer took an action to review the material on the websites to ensure it is clear and up to date.**
2. **Action: James Radley took an action to pull the constitution review group together, nominate a Chairman and bring recommendations back to the next Meeting.**
3. **Action: FAL took an action to respond to those questions they can answer and provide reasons for those to which they cannot respond by Friday 19th February 2021.**
4. **Action: Mike Grant took an action to propose what the FACC could be doing to make a contribution to the Climate Emergency.**
5. **Action: Geoff Marks took an action to provide some thoughts on noise metrics.**

## **Questions – Does FACC Manage this Well?**

The Secretary – Email Following the last Meeting.  
18 November 2020.

Dear Committee Member,

Members who have been attending the FACC meetings regularly over the years will be aware it is practice to request questions be submitted a week before the meeting itself.

Questions tend to be detailed or technical in nature. Having a week to prepare ensures questions can be answered on the day and by the Member most qualified to do so.

Anyone attending can of course ask a question at the meeting, and do so all the time, but this does not guarantee an immediate answer. Questions may be directed, for example, at Members not present; if questions are pre-advised answers can be sought and read out on the day by an alternate or the Chairman, as often happens.

Those questions pre-advised or asked on the day which cannot be answered are responded to as soon after the meeting as possible. This also applies to questions submitted after the cut-off date.

I have received a number of emails questioning this practice. If the Committee feel there is a better way to manage the response to questions, please provide your thoughts and I will be happy to review these and submit them to Committee of discussion. Given the workload of all concerned I feel the current practice works well and allows a considered response to be generated for each question.

### **Responses from Members**

**Gareth Saunders** – Church Crookham Parish Council

I agree that the current practice works well, and would support it continuing.

**Maurice Sheehan** - Rushmoor Borough Council

I think the current system works well and therefore does not need to be changed.

**Geoff Marks** – Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc

I am more than happy with the way you deal with questions.

I am also happy that, in practice, questions are dealt with ex committee. Perhaps this could be formalised given that response times for consultations, for example, may be as little as 6 weeks. A current case being the DfT's consultation on its revised PSZ policy, the deadline is mid-December and it would be helpful to have RBC's and FAL's views on the proposal.

**Brian Edmonds** - Farnham Town Council

It is recommended that at least a week's notice be given for any question to be answered at the meeting. It is unreasonable that technical questions be answered within a shorter time scale.

*Thank you for your thoughts on this subject.*