



**FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
 “keeping people informed”

**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON**  
**21 February 2019**  
 at  
**RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Philip	Riley	Chairman
Whittacre	Hope	Secretary
David	Attfield	Farnham District Council
Cllr. Chris	Axam	Hart District Council
Bill	Cole	Ash Parish Council
Maggie	Gault	NATS
Christina	Harris	Church Crookham Parish Council
Norman	Lambert	Crandall Parish Council
Chris	Main	Mytchett Deepcut & Frimley Green
Geoff	Marks	FARA
Brandon	O'Reilly	TAG Farnborough
Chris	Pitt	Surrey Heath Borough Council ?
James	Radley	Hart District Council
Jenny	Radley	Fleet & Church Crookham Society
Gareth	Saunders	Church Crookham Parish Council
Neil	Theuma	Farnborough International Ltd.
Miles	Thomas	TAG Farnborough
Roger	Walker	TAG Farnborough

**Item 1 – Apologies Received:**

Virginia	Barratt	Farnborough College of Technology
Josephine	Hawkins	Surrey Heath BC
Peter	Isherwood	Waverley BC
Wally	Epton	WJE Associates

RBC - Taylor ?  
 HCC - Dibbs ?

## Item 2. Appointment of Secretary

John Gregory, Secretary to the FACC for more than ten years, retired from his position at the end of 2018. The Chairman offered his sincere thanks to John for all his hard work, dedication and enthusiasm over the years.

The Chairman introduced Whittacre Hope, formerly Treasurer of Export and Structured Finance at BAE Systems plc and asked the Committee to accept his nomination as the new Secretary to the FACC. The nomination was accepted and endorsed by the Committee.

## Item 3. Minutes of Meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2018 and Matters Arising

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.
2. Geoff Marks, FARA, pointed out the Minutes indicated that Maurice Sheehan, Rushmoor BC, had attended the meeting and this was not the case. This has been corrected.
3. Hugh Shepard, a member of the public, pointed out that in Item 7 - Questions from Members of the Public, names of those asking questions were not attributed and he felt this should be the case in future if possible.
4. In response to an action from the last meeting, TAG provided a short legal response as to why under GDPR, it is illegal and therefore not possible to identify individual objectors, their addresses, roads or areas in which they live without their written approval. A discussion ensued.

Jenny Radley, Fleet & Crookham CS, felt the information provided to the Meeting by TAG, the Complaint Report and the Complaint by Postcode Report did not sufficiently identify the location from where the complaint originated.

Miles Thomas, TAG, explained that TAG takes both its responsibilities to report any complaints and GDPR very seriously. Time and effort are expended in addressing the complaints, validating and reporting them. His position and that of TAG is that nothing more can be done to further identify the location of the complainant, from his stand-point.

To provide an avenue for communication between complainants and Civic Group representatives it was suggested that relevant FACC members details should be published on the TAG website following official confirmation of their consent.

**Action: Civic Group Representatives on the FACC Committee to provide official confirmation of their consent to have their contact details published on the TAG website (FAO Miles Thomas).**

This direction of conversation raised the issue of advertising the names and contact details of the FACC Members on the FACC website.

It was agreed no further action would be taken at this time. However,

7  
6  
**Action: TAG/the FACC Secretary took an action to establish the implications of GDPR with regard to the FACC Website.**

5. In response to an action from the last meeting, the Chairman had received a letter from David Fletcher, Hampshire County Council, regarding a potential spur to Farnborough Aerodrome from a planned ESSO pipeline from Fawley to Heathrow. This letter explains why ESSO has no plans to build a spur. The letter has been circulated and can be found on the FACC website.

7  
|| Jenny Radley asked TAG if not requesting a spur was not a lost opportunity for the town and the airport and to explain the current logistics of fuel deliveries.

Brandon O'Reilly responded. The airport, on average, receives three tankers of fuel on weekdays and two a day at weekends. TAG does not currently buy fuel from ESSO. It would not want to constrain itself commercially or logistically by dealing exclusively with one supplier. Mr O'Reilly indicated that as the airport grows there will be a corresponding increase in the requirement for fuel. This issue and the management of it, is of great importance to TAG. He shared how a number of solutions could be applied but that these were not needed in the foreseeable future. The significant capital expense of constructing a spur to the airport would not be carried by ESSO and TAG has no plans to fund such a project.

6. No representatives from Rushmoor BC, Surrey CC or Waverly BC attended the meeting. Geoff Marks asked that it be noted Rushmoor BC was absent as this is an appropriate forum to discuss matters arising, receive and answer question from the Committee and the Public.

**Action: FACC Chairman/Secretary to write to Rushmoor BC about attendance.**

**Item 4. TAG Information Report.**

7  
|| Brandon O'Reilly was pleased with the overall performance of the airport in 2018 at all levels of operation while embracing the relationship with local people, government and commerce and strictly within the self-imposed respect for the environment.

In May 2018, TAG Farnborough Airport was confirmed as achieving carbon neutrality and in doing so became the first business aviation airport in the world to achieve the top tier of Airport Carbon Accreditation.

In 2018 total movements increased by 13.8% to 30,731 of which 29,958 were reportable to RBC against a permitted level of 49,000. As mentioned at the last meeting TAG forecast a more modest level of growth for 2019, to 32,200 TAG handled. The RBC reportable permitted level is 50,000 movements per annum.

Business aviation is seeing good levels of growth however, international and regional airports are restricted by the number of slots they have. This pressure is forcing general aviation away from the larger airports to those specialising in business and GA activities.

The closure of Northolt for 6 months later this year will likely increase the number of movements from Farnborough.

The "A" Shed has been demolished allowing the construction of the Gulfstream facility to commence. This is expected to open and be operational by May 2020 ahead of FIA and slightly ahead of schedule.

**Brandon O'Reilly reminded the audience that the TAG Flying Scholarship for 2019 was open for applications. The Chairman** asked if this was limited to any particular age-group. The minimum age is 17 years old.

Geoff Marks asked if TAG Farnborough Airport was updating its masterplan. Brandon O'Reilly responded by saying Masterplan contains detailed plans through 2019 and indicative comments through to 2030. Commencement of an update to the plan is anticipated once implementation of the ACP is certain, given the current JR which is due to be heard in June 2019.

Mixed up

Note  
Judicial Review

slb.  
adoption  
RSC CP.

**Item 5. TAG Reports**

Miles Thomas presented his report.

Jenny Radley reminded the Committee that the majority of complaints relate to movements at weekends and the reports show a disproportionate number of movements of heavy aircraft over these days. — VIP (OAA) flight.

Brandon O'Reilly and Miles responded. The data in the reports is accurate and portrays the movement profile with all transparency. It is a theme of business aviation that levels of movements/travel requirements are higher over the weekend. That is the nature of the business. The numbers recorded are within the permitted levels.

As requested by Jenny Radley contact details for making public tour arrangements at the airport was provided in the TAG report. Jenny Radley felt it was difficult to find and asked if it could be more prominent.

**Item 6. Airspace Change Proposal**

Roger Walker reported there was little change to his report from the last meeting regarding ACP. The CAA's airspace proposals approved on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018, are subject to an ongoing judicial review. It is hoped there will be clarification of the final position by the end of the year. TAG will await this with interest.

Last Hbr rpt 2018

JR hearing June 2019

Roger did say in the absence of a final position, TAG is giving the matter consideration and the workflow requirement of ACP will be a component of the Implementation Plan which should be available by the time of the next meeting.

**Item 8. Questions from Members of the Public**

Hamish Johnson asked the following questions:

The TAG report shows 6 ADS ATMs in May and 698 in July 2018. How are these flights classified? Are they solely connected with flights in and out for those working at the FIA or do they include display aircraft or what?

Additionally, how do they effect the TAG Monthly FACC figures?

Miles responded: I can confirm that FIA movements are classified as any movement associated with, booked, charged and handled by Farnborough International Limited (the FIA operators) rather than TAG Farnborough Airport. This includes all static display aircraft arriving for and departing from the show as well as any flying display movements during validation (week 1) and show week.

The movements listed as FIA-related in May occurred as a result of a Press Day, which also takes place biennially, used to publicise the forthcoming show.

With respect to the calculations you made relating to "other" flights for May and July, I am not clear on what it is you wish me to provide? The calculations you have made using the information provided by table 1.2 of the FACC TAG Information Report are correct and therefore the same process can be applied for the other months of the year. I hope this answers your question, if not happy to discuss after the meeting.

**Item 9. Matters raised by Members of the Committee.**

The Committee received two question from Geoff Marks; these were circulated to the Committee for information and to Rushmoor BC for a response. Please see attached.

**Item 10. Date of Next Meetings of the Committee**

- *Thursday 27<sup>st</sup> June 2019*
- *Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> November 2019*

All meetings will take place at Rushmoor BC at 14:00 hrs.

## **Item 9. Matters Raised by Members of the Committee – Continued.**

Two question submitted by Geoff Marks – FARA.

### **Airport Policies in the New Local Plan**

Following the completion of a Planning Inspectorate Examination in Public, Rushmoor has adopted a Local Plan that will inform its airport policies up to 2032. The Inspector concluded that Rushmoor's third party risk and noise policies based on modelled annual individual contour and Laeq noise contour limits is sound. This submission questions those conclusions.

### **Third Party Risk**

Public Safety Zone (PSZ) modelling is based on an operator's forecast of a total number and a mix of aircraft movements. PSZ contours submitted by TAG in support of its planning application and subsequent 2010 Appeal, were also adopted by Rushmoor as the limiting annual individual risk contour lengths in the planning permission for 50,000 atms of business aviation.

Annual risk contour audits are undertaken by NATS to demonstrate that Rushmoor's limits, and the DfT's PSZ policy, are not been breached. In a standard preamble the audits note that "The risk contour limits were defined for the current planning permission using predicted traffic data for 50,000 movements at the airport." It follows that Rushmoor's planning permission recognises limiting contours modelled on the basis of a number and mix of aircraft including a forward estimate of the 'other movements' that fall outside the parameters of the planning permission.

Contour lengths increase as the number of movements and/or mean weight increases. Therefore, the PSZ/Rushmoor individual risk contour limits will inevitably always constrain the movements subject to the planning permission to a level below the 50,000 'commercial' atms limit.

**Question.** Rushmoor has no control over the contour modelling process. A lack of transparency in the DfT's PSZ modelling process appears to be insurmountable, and a clear distinction between Rushmoor's and the DfT's contours has been lost. The straightforward atm movement limit is readily understood by all. Therefore, would the FACC please ask Rushmoor and the Inspectorate to justify the retention of the risk contour policies in the local plan, together with the contour auditing requirement, when the Council's duty of care is being fully met by compliance with the DfT's **current** PSZ policy? This is a question that the DfT may be addressing in its review of PSZ policy.

### **Noise**

The current allowable area of a Laeq noise contour is modelled on the basis of the permitted 50,000 business aviation movements, unlike the risk contours which include an estimated number of 'Other movements'. The exclusion of 'Other movements' in the modelling of the noise contour is defended by the Inspector on the grounds that they are "lawful, previously established, and operate outside of a planning permission relating to civilian movements."

Business aviation movements were also 'lawful and previously established' before being brought under planning control in 2003. This was done with the express agreement of the MoD presumably because it paved the way for its eventual withdrawal and sale of the site. From Rushmoor's perspective, it is the duty of a public authority to act judicially, ie. fairly, whenever it makes decisions that affect people's rights or interests. It would appear to be untenable to consider 'Other movements' of any passenger aircraft at TAG Farnborough airport as anything other than a civilian operation.

**Question.** On the above grounds, would the FACC please formally request Rushmoor and the Inspector to reconsider the exclusion of 'Other movements' of passenger aircraft types in the modelling of the allowable Laeq noise contour?

**A response to the questions was submitted to and read out by the Chairman at the meeting:**

Please find below the Council's response to the questions raised.

The opportunity to make formal representations to the Council on the policies proposed within the draft Local Plan was when it went out to full public consultation both in 2015 (the 'preferred approach') and in 2017 (the 'draft submission' version). FARA made representations at each stage, including the points raised in the submitted question.

Examination of the draft submission Rushmoor Local Plan took place in May 2018. FARA appeared at the Examination and made representations directly to the Inspector. After carefully considering all comments and representations to her, she has now concluded that the Local Plan is 'sound' and that it provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the borough, subject to some modifications (which did not relate to the flying policies). At Rushmoor's Cabinet on 5<sup>th</sup>. February, Members accepted the modifications and unanimously agreed to recommend the new Local Plan to Full Council for adoption.

The Local Plan will be considered for formal adoption by the Council on 21 February 2019 (this evening)

Further detail can be found on Council website: <https://www.rushmoor.gov.uk/rushmoorplan>

The process of the preparation and consideration of the Local Plan is now complete. The Inspector has closed her Examination and there is no opportunity to re-open it.

