



## FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 24<sup>th</sup> February 2022 Held Online with MS Teams.

#### In Attendance:

Philip Whittacre	Riley Hope	Chairman Secretary
Chris	Axam	Hart District Council
Gareth	Andrews	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Rod	Cooper	Hampshire County Council
Ian	Dickson	NATS
Les	Freer	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Brian	Edmunds	Farnham Town Council
Paul	Follows	Waverley Borough Council
Simon	Geere	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Sarah	Kinsley	Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut
Geoff	Marks	FARA
James	Radley	Hart District Council
Jenny	Radley	Fleet & Church Crookham Society
Gareth	Saunders	Church Crookham Parish Council
Steven	Hunt	Farnborough College of Technology
Maurice	Sheehan	Rushmoor Borough Council
Paul	Taylor	Rushmoor Borough Council
David	Lewis	Surrey County Council
Clarke	Mouncher	Gulfstream Aerospace Ltd.
Marwan	Khalek	GAMA Aviation
Anne-Marie	Barker	Woking Borough Council
John	Redpath	Guildford Borough Council
Duncan	Rae	Dassault Aviation Group
Gary	Bredin	Ewshot Parish Council
Joanne	Goodall	TAG Aviation Ltd
Bob	McShee	Guildford Borough Council
Jules	Crossley	Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth

**Attendance: 45 Including the above.**

## Introduction

The Chairman opened the Meeting by stating our thoughts and best wishes were with the People of the Ukraine on this inauspicious day in their History.

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

The Chairman referred to the meeting of the Committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> February which heard a presentation supporting the application for Membership to the Committee by Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth (BVFoE). Following the presentation and questions, the Members unanimously voted to approve the application of BVFoE as the Committee Representative for Local Environmental Groups.

Jules Crossley is the appointed representative of BVFoE, with Sarah Wood as her reserve/deputy/alternate.

Please see Appendix 1 for further details.

### Item 1 Apologies Received:

Virginia Barrett	Farnborough College of Technology
Norman Lambert	Crondall Parish Council
Ben Gleeson	Farnborough International
George Hesse	Farnham Town Council
Helen Whitcroft	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Bill Cole	Ash Parish Council

### Item 2. Minutes of Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2021 and Matters Arising.

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

Actions from the Meeting:

Action 1: [The Secretary will place the Farnborough Airport Community Environment Fund presentation from June 2021 on the FACC website.](#)

Presentation has been uploaded to the website but against the wrong meeting as pointed out by Jenny Radley - Fleet & Church Crookham Society. This error will be corrected when the updated website goes live in March 2022.

Action 2: [Les Freer and the Webmaster to continue to review and update FACC website. Jenny Radley to offer comments.](#)

A meeting was held with the review remaining a work-in-progress.

Action 3: [Les Freer to feedback response from the CAA on the Airport designation.](#)

See Appendix 2

Action 4: [Secretary to amend and circulate the New Constitution to Members.](#)

Completed.

- Action 5: The Webmaster will upload the New Constitution to the FACC website.  
Completed. The website is being updated and will go on line in the first week of March 2022.
- Action 6: The Chairman and Secretary will contact Woking BC, Guildford BC and Ewshot PC to invite them to join the FACC.  
Completed., Update at Meeting.
- Action 7: Gareth Andrews to provide a breakdown of the 'other aviation activity' figure from February 2021.  
Completed. Gareth has been asked to circulate to those who have not seen it.
- Action 8: Gareth Andrews will liaise with the Secretary to facilitate contact with the individual complainant from Hindhead.  
Invitation issued – Resident now wishes to take up issue with the Chairman of Macquarie Bank.
- Action 9: Gareth Andrews will re-order the Complaints Report in future  
Completed.
- Action 10: FAL and NATS to review the questions and responses to Mr Shearn and Mr Sheppard on AONB.  
Responses provided with draft minutes 1<sup>st</sup> November 2021.  
Hugh Sheppard - CPRE had pointed out ahead of the meeting that one of his questions was not answered. Please see the question and discussion later in these Minutes.
- Action 11: The new membership on the Committee would be advertised in the local press and on the FACC website by 15th December.  
Completed.

**Matters arising from the minutes:**

Geoff Marks – FARA, pointed out that in Item 7 on page 9 in the Minutes of the October Meeting, Les Freer had undertaken to update the Committee on his meeting with RBC on 10<sup>th</sup> November, regarding the PSZ.

Les Freer – Farnborough Airport responded that the revised PSZ changes came into effect in late 2021. FAL/RBC agreed to submit the 2021 PSZ reports in the old format to complete the year and following submission of the 2021 reports to RBC both parties would then look to meet in Q1 2022 to discuss and agree any reporting changes that may be required in light of the changes to the PSZ's.

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. Membership Of the Committee.**

The Chairman covered this matter in his opening comments. Further details in Appendix 1.

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

**Traffic:** December 2021 year-end ATMs (Air Traffic Movements) closed up c30% against prior year. This resulted in 2021 being c80% of 2019 levels whereas 2020 was c60% of 2019 levels.

2021 was a contrasting year for traffic activity, with the first 6 months down - 46% against 2019 and the second 6 months up 4%. September was the busiest month on record with 3,515 flights.

Unrestricted travel has helped to maintain levels, with the added benefit of the continued resurgence for travel from the US market.

For the start of 2022, performance in January was impacted by Omicron however the underlying strong traffic trend from the second half of 2021 has continued such that ATM activity recorded beat the previous month record (January 2020).

**Development:** Planning permission for the £35m investment in the new Hangar 3 project was granted on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2022 by RBC.

Planning for the Airshow 2022 has ramped up and FAL now have a scheduled bi-weekly meeting with key staff and stakeholders.

**Sustainability:** Carbon Footprint for 2020 has been complete by consultants Ricardo and the 2021 work is underway. The current thinking is that FAL will publish its independent verification certification for its annual Airport Carbon Accreditation submission, that way more visibility will be available around carbon emission performance/improvement.

An LED lighting replacement programme is underway within Hangar 2 and the Ground Support Facility building. Current fluorescent and halogen lighting in high bay positions in Hangar 2 and the Ground Services Facility will be replaced with energy efficient LED light fittings. The works are scheduled to be completed by the end of March.

Quotes are now in from two national providers to upgrade current and install new EV vehicle charging infrastructure, to be able to provide EV access for employees and tenants.

HVO (Hydrotreated Vegetable Oil) discussions have taken place, the red diesel replacement will be phased in by the end of March at the latest. This will reduce the used diesel emissions by up to 90%, a key part in our road map to net zero.

Ricardo has completed their onsite heating assessment (31/01/22) which will tie into our road map to net zero.

Annual review and updates for various policies were submitted and approved by HSSER (FAL board sub-committee - Health, Safety, Security, Environment and Risk Committee), these were: Sustainability Policy (Aviator and FAL), Environment Policy (FAL), Energy Policy (FAL), Sustainable Procurement Policy (FAL).

Litter picking was conducted along the perimeter fence, ten rubbish bags of waste was collected by participating staff and over 200 trees were planted by FAL staff in Southwood Park.

Our full Environmental Management System audit will take place in March 2022.

**Media:** Media briefings took place on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> February with 16 press representatives (a mixture of trade and nationals). FAL announced its ATM performance for 2021 and also a number of development initiatives including Hangar 3 and also its partnership with eVTOL (electric Vertical Take-Off and Landing) manufacturer Vertical Aerospace.

Various filming opportunities have also been booked in for March for a number of movie companies who use the airport to feature in their productions.

**People & Recruitment.** A review of the Company's pay and recognition framework has been undertaken to improve reward and recognition of employees.

- Increased employer pension contributions
- Increased annual leave entitlement
- New and enhanced health care provision

Recruitment and retention is an increasing challenge. FAL have budgeted an increase of 22 FTE in 2022, of which:

- 3 vacancies have been filled
- 15 vacancies actively recruiting
- 4 vacancies not yet actively recruiting

Apprenticeships 2022, engagement continues with Farnborough Technology College and we are attending their Careers Fair on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. Apprenticeship recruitment advertisements will go live at the start of March 2022 and we are still on track to start Farnborough Airports Apprenticeship programme September 2022.

**Aviator & Swan:** Average occupancy for the Aviator during the rolling 12-month period February 2021 – January 2022 was 63%, which compared to the local market of 40% is a relatively strong performance. Further a Real Living Wage policy introduced from 1 Jan 2022.

#### **Questions arising from Simon Geer's report:**

Sarah Kinsley - Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut, Pointed out that while LED had many environmental benefits, research has shown they are not so friendly to wildlife of the night.

Sarah kindly offered to share some of this research information.

Simon Geere wanted to point out the LED Lighting was used inside not outside.

#### **Action: Sarah Kinsley to forward LED Lighting research.**

Geoff Marks – Had submitted observations/questions on the revised PSZ and PIR as shown and attached at Appendix 3.

Les Freer – Responded, changes to the PSZ (Public Safety Zones) were made following the

DfT./CAA consultation process and the Airport submitted revised maps to RBC/Harts and the CAA as obligated to do.

Richard Ward -RBC said, the revised PSZs are now Government policy and the Government have provided guidance on how local planning authorities should decide planning applications within the land affected. The Airport has provided revised PSZ maps to the Council, which are up on the Council website, and these now form the areas within which certain types of development will be restricted.

The 1:10,000 & 1:100,000 risk contours defined by the Airport Planning Consent have not changed **as a result of the change in the government's PSZ policy**, nor has the S106 requirement for the Airport to undertake a safety audit addressing third party risk once a year. From his perspective, the airport will continue to provide its annual 3<sup>rd</sup> party risk audit to RBC in line with its stated S106 requirements.

The Council is still awaiting publication of the CAA's Comments Response Document which it hopes will provide the answers to the questions raised in its consultation response.

Richard will contact the CAA to ask when RBC can expect publication of the Comments Response Document.

Paul Taylor – RBC, James Radley -Hart District Council, Brian Edmonds Farnham Town Council joined the discussion.

Geoff Marks asked - Will RBC use the 1:10,000 & 1:100,000 risk contours defined by the Airport Planning Consent as the areas within which development will be restricted, rather than the revised PSZs?

Richard Ward answered that this was a matter to be decided by RBC having taken legal/expert planning advice.

Brian Edmonds said he would be concerned if restrictions were reduced.

Les Freer commented that the PSZ methodology had been established many years ago. Aircraft safety has improved significantly over the past few decades which was a significant contributory factor in the CAA decision to consult on changes to the PSZ.

The Chairman asked if a paper explaining this very technical subject could be written for the benefit of the other Members.

**Action: Les Freer, Geoff Marks and Richard Ward will produce an explanatory paper.**

**Action: Richard Ward will set down the RBC PSZ Policy.**

**Action: James Radley will provide details, if any, of the Hart DC PSZ Policy.**

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

Jules Crosley asked Simon Geere how many apprenticeship the Airport would offer this year?

Simon Geere responded – four (4).

Jules Crosley asked Simon Geere if the Airport had installed solar panels and planned to do so on the new hangar?

Simon Geere responded yes, it did have a small number of solar panels on site, solar panels can be incompatible with airport radars, but there was a commercial and environmental rationale to look at this in more detail.

Sarah Kinsley asked, with regard to the PSZ discussion, was the Safety Report available.

Simon Geere responded yes.

**Action: FAL to supply Safety Report.**

Les Freer added that a read of the CAA's overview of PSZ policy changes would provide some clarity.

The link for this is:

<https://consultations.caa.co.uk/aerodrome-standards-department/public-safety-zones/>

Geoff Marks suggests Members review the CAA Response Document, here below.



20220225Consultati  
on response documer

**Item 5. Farnborough Airport Carbon Footprint Report – Dr Mark Hinnells of Ricardo.**

This presentation will be uploaded the FACC website.

The proposed FAL Net Zero Road Map will go to the Board in April.

**Questions.**

Brian Edmunds asked, SAF (Sustainable Aviation Fuel) are these products carbon neutral/sustainable when the manufacturing process is factored in.

Mark Hinnells provided a detailed explanation in the manufacture and use of Bio-Mass and Hydrogen based SAF.

In summary, on balance, yes the science worked and the manufacture, use, recapture and manufacture cycle was carbon neutral.

He qualified this by saying SAF is manufactured and supplied/transported in small uneconomic quantities at present. When manufacturing and application is scaled up the cycle will be carbon neutral.

This point was also raised by Marwan Khalek – GAMA Aviation.

Sarah Kinsley asked if the Airport sourced its power from environmentally responsible suppliers?

Simon Geere responded, yes it did. All off site generated power is procured from Renewable

Energy Guarantees of Origin (REGO) accredited suppliers.

**Item 6. Farnborough Airport Reports – Gareth Andrews.**

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

**Questions.**

Jenny Radley said she had a few points but would catch-up off-line.

Gareth Saunders - Church Crookham Parish Council referred to a meeting he had had with the Airport where Les Freer had agreed to review and revert to him on properties overflown. Had Les managed to do this yet?

Gareth Saunders went on to say that things had improved since the meeting, but there were a couple of actions that Les Freer had agreed to respond to which required input from NATS.

Les Freer responded that regrettably he had not done so yet, but he would.

**Item 7. Update on Airspace Change – Les Freer**

FAL received confirmation on the next stages of the ACP PIR from the CAA last Friday (as the CAA had promised to do last Oct) and the CAA have updated their website accordingly. The Airport and FACC websites have been updated this week.

Airspace Change Proposals Post-Implementation Reviews (PIRs) impacted by COVID 19 - Update February 2022 (This page was amended on 17/02/2022).

A Post Implementation Review is conducted at Stage 7 of the Airspace Change process for CAP 1616 and CAP 725 airspace change proposals. The purpose of the PIR is to enable the CAA to consider whether the anticipated impact and benefits of the change have been delivered. To inform this review, which usually takes place 12 months after the change has been implemented, the change sponsor is required to commence the collection of data on the impacts of the change as soon as the change is implemented and to collect a year of data. The data is used to enable a comparison to be made between pre and post implementation operations. A year of data is required to provide data on all operating conditions which change over the seasons. Indicative PIR data requirements are listed in CAP 1616 and include impact on airspace users, those on the ground and any environmental impacts.

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic and its impact on air operations around the globe including in the UK, PIR data collection has been suspended since the FAL website update in August 2020. Since that time, FAL has regularly reviewed the position and concluded that the continued impact of the Covid Pandemic on air operations around the globe continues to result in a very different use of airspace than could have been contemplated pre-February 2020.

The Airport will update the PIR website page from February 2022. Whilst the effects of the pandemic are subtly different to those of six months ago, FAL recognises that its impacts on airspace use continues to be different to that pre-February 2020 and therefore the evaluation of data for the purposes of a PIR may not enable a direct comparison pre and post implementation.

The CAA therefore considers that the process for recently approved and future airspace change proposals, PIRs should be subject to a review and the CAA intends to consult on the PIR process



in the CAP 1616 Airspace Change Process review later this year.

It is the opinion of the CAA that a sufficient increase in air travel, particularly in the commercial air transport sector is now likely throughout 2022 and therefore, for those delayed and outstanding PIRs we now require sponsors to commence data collection for the purposes of PIRs as follows:

1. Any data collected between 1 March 2020 and 28 February 2022 cannot be used as part of a PIR data set. This statement applies to all implemented ACPs due to commence a PIR.
2. Sponsors of ACPs should commence data collection from 27th March 2022. A phased approach to commencement of data collection may be taken by sponsors to take account of resourcing requirements. Therefore, commencement of data may be initiated at any point between the 27th March 2022 and 27th September 2022.  
In all cases the CAA would require that 12 months of data is collected. Should the consultation being conducted by the CAA on the PIR process result in any changes this will be published on the CAA website and articulated to sponsors conducting PIR data collection.
3. Sponsors should advise CAA Airspace Regulation of the date they are commencing data collection. This date should also be published on the sponsors website to ensure their stakeholders remain informed of progress.
4. Additionally, where PIR data collection was commenced before the onset of the pandemic our policy remains as amended that:
  - a. Any PIR data collected by a change sponsor and any analysis by the sponsor which has been completed by 27 February 2020, can be used to as part of a PIR dataset necessary to complete the PIR review in accordance with CAP 1616 or CAP 725 as appropriate.
  - b. Where an ACP has been implemented and more than 9 months PIR data collection has been achieved up to 27 February 2020, the CAA may decide it has sufficient data to conduct the PIR review. Where a change sponsor considers that they have such data, they should contact the CAA Airspace Regulation team to determine if this data is sufficient for the PIR review to take place.

All PIRs of ACPs still following the CAP725 process will be conducted in accordance with the process requirements of CAP1616. However, when assessing the expected impacts against the actual impacts we will use the methodology applied at the time of the original decision (either UK Air Navigation Guidance 2014 or 2017). Any sponsors with queries regarding the above should contact the CAA at [Airspace.Policy@caa.co.uk](mailto:Airspace.Policy@caa.co.uk).

#### Post Implementation Reviews

Post Implementation Reviews provide a rigorous assessment by the CAA, as the independent regulator, of whether the anticipated impacts and benefits, set out in the original airspace change proposal and decision, have been delivered and if not to ascertain why and to determine the most appropriate course of action.

The review can be an iterative process and the nature of each review will be determined by the scale and impact of the airspace change itself. The main stages are shown below.

- 1) Post Implementation Review initiated
- 2) Data collection and analysis
- 3) CAA assessment
- 4) Report

#### **Next Steps**

- a) FAL to notify CAA of intended start date (27<sup>th</sup> March)
- b) FAL will provide a layman's overview of the process, to include;
  - a. Summary of CAP 1616 (CAA process)
  - b. Required analytics
  - c. Timings
  - d. Stakeholder engagement
  - e. Proposed comms strategy

**Action: FAL to supply a layman's Overview of the PIR process over the next 12 months.**

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

**Action: Secretary to circulate CAA document to FACC Members.**

Simon Geere remarked that the Members should read the two sections of the CAA PIR Guidance Document. The web-site links can be found Appendix 4 as attached.

Questions:

Jules Crossley asked if the scope of PIR would be on the FACC website.

Chairman answered if it was not already there, yes it would be on the website.

Geoff Marks urged Members to look at the CAA Airspace Change Portal and specifically the CAA Safety & Regulation Airspace Group's environmental assessment of the original TAG Environmental Assessment. He also suggested that the CAA's CAP 1616a and CAP 1129 were useful guides to the metrics that the CAA may be expected to use to inform the PIR.

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

##### **Members Questions**

Hugh Sheppard - 'My interpretation of recent responses to questions about the height of Farnborough incoming or outgoing aircraft above the Surrey AONB amounts to neither NATS nor FAL's ATC taking any responsibility for implementing the preferred height of above 7,000 ft as set out in Air Navigation Guidance. Is that correct?

Ian Dickson -NATS, responded neither FAL nor Farnborough ATC dictate the routings of arriving/departing aircraft, instead, these were laid out during the SID/STAR designs.

Ian did say, he did not know if AONB's were taken into consideration when designing ACP. He

will speak with relevant parties within NATS to gain further insight into this.

**Action: Ian Dickson NATS to review and respond to Question from H Sheppard.  
Please see attached at Appendix 3.**

Bob McShee- Guildford Borough Council -submitted a question on behalf of a resident, Mr Partridge, attached at Appendix 3.

Ian Dickson suggested the FAL and NATS will draft a response.

**Action: FAL and NATS to supply a response to question from Mr Partridge.**

Bob McShee, referring back the questions on Surrey AONB asked if any of this was related to Airspace Change?

Les Freer answered no, it is not.

### **Questions from Members of the Public**

Colin Shearn - Farnborough Noise – Submitted a number of questions to the meeting, these are attached along with responses from FAL, NATS and the FACC at Appendix 3.

Mr Shearn remarked with regard to Airspace Change, the increase in commercial and general aviation outside the new flight paths was significant and this should be taken into consideration by the CAA in PIR.

Richard 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.

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

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

The Chairman mentioned the FACC had responded to the DfT Questionnaire on Consultative Committees. He was disappointed only three Members had submitted their thoughts on the proposed response.

The Chairman mentioned with the end of COVID restrictions the Committee would need to decide how it would like future meetings to be held either online, in person or a hybrid of both. The Secretary will undertake a review of Members views.

Sarah Kingsley asked if the Airport had had to take any action/upgrade of its RADARs in light of the issues caused by 5G?

Les Freer responded that the Airport has received a few enquiries which when received are dealt with by our safeguarding team.

Ian Dickson responded that the CAA has issued guidance and NATS technical team will undertake a review.

Brian Edmunds remarked that he felt hybrid meetings should be used by the FACC in the future.

**Item 9. Date of the Next Meeting.**

The next meetings of the Committee will take place on:

**Thursday 23rd June 2022 and Thursday 27th October 2022.**

Medium/Location to be advised.

***The Meeting was declared closed***

## Appendix 1

### FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**Meeting Tuesday 22nd February 2022 at 14:00 hrs**

**Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth Presentation  
Supporting an Application for Membership.**

**To be held online with MS Teams.**

#### Minutes

#### In Attendance:

Philip Whittacre	Riley Hope	Chairman
Chris Gareth	Axam Andrews	Secretary
Rod Ian	Cooper Dickson	Hart District Council
Les Sarah	Freer Kinsley	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Geoff James	Marks Radley	Hampshire County Council
Jenny Gareth	Radley Saunders	NATS
Virginia Maurice	Barrett Sheehan	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Paul David	Taylor Lewis	Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut
Clarke Marwan	Mouncher Khalek	FARA
Anne-Marie John	Barker Redpath	Hart District Council
Duncan Gary	Rae Bredin	Fleet & Church Crookham Society
Jules Sarah	Crossley Wood	Church Crookham Parish Council
		Farnborough College of Technology
		Rushmoor Borough Council
		Rushmoor Borough Council
		Surrey County Council
		Gulfstream Aerospace Ltd.
		GAMA Aviation
		Woking Borough Council
		Guildford Borough Council
		Dassault Aviation Group
		Ewshot Parish Council
		Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth
		Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth

The Chairman opened the Meeting and took time to name all the new Members of the Committee as detailed below.

The chairman then introduced Jules Crossley and Sarah Wood of Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth Presentation, outlined the purpose of the Meeting and the proposed procedure.

Item 1. Apologies for Absence

Simon Geere  
Norman Lambert  
Helen Whitcroft  
Bob McShee  
George Hesse  
Joanne Goodall

Item 2. New Members Update - The Chairman. Please see attached.

Item 3. Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth Presentation –

Jules Crossley and Sarah Wood.

Item 4. Questions from Members

Item 5. BVFoE Left the Meeting

Item 6. Discussion about BVFoE Application and Decision on Membership

The Committee voted unanimously to approve Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth as a Member of the Committee.

*Close of Meeting*

## FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### **New Members February 2022 Following the Meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2022**

#### **USERS**

<b>Duncan Rae</b>	Dassault Aviation Group Ltd
<b>Clarke Moucher</b>	Gulfstream Aerospace Ltd
<b>Joanne Goodall</b>	TAG Aviation Ltd

#### **LOCAL AUTHORITIES**

<b>Cllr Bob McShee</b>	Guildford Borough Council
<b>Cllr David Lewis</b>	Surrey County Council
<b>Cllr Helen Whitcroft</b>	Surrey Heath Borough Council
<b>Cllr Ann-Marie Barker</b>	Woking Borough Council

#### **LOCAL INTERESTS**

<b>Cllr Gary Bredin</b>	Ewshot Parish Council
<b>Jules Crossley</b>	Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth

#### **ALTERNATES/DEPUTIES**

<b>Cllr Eleanor Jennings</b>	Ewshot Parish Council
<b>Cllr John Redpath</b>	Guildford Borough Council
<b>Thierry Barre</b>	Dassault Aviation Ltd
<b>Sarah Wood</b>	Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth

## Appendix 2 - Actions Update from Previous Meeting.

Action 3: Les Freer to feedback response from the CAA on the Airport designation.

Summary of replies from the CAA and the DfT on the subject of airport designation under Section 35 of the Air Transport Act:

- 1) CAA confirmed that FAB was not on the original Order as at the time this was drafted FAB was a military airport.
- 2) FAB has a mature Consultative Committee and are fully compliant with the requirements of Act (CAA & DfT both agree on this).
- 3) The DfT's view is that if there is no material benefit to be gained by amending the list, then it hasn't been their policy to do so. Hence with FAB being fully compliant there is no benefit to be gained by adding FAB to the Order previously or now.
- 4) The DfT is currently in the process of gathering views from the UK's ACC network on their role and the challenges they face. A full review of the designations may well be one of the considerations that comes out of this work, at which point we would likely need to formally consult on any additions.



## Appendix 3 - Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public

### Geoff Marks Observations/Questions for the Committee – February 2022

I have the following comments/observations on Simon Geere's Report circulated for the next FACC Meeting.

#### The Revised Public Safety Zone (PSZ) Circular

Mr Geere's report does not mention the government's adoption of significant changes to its Public Safety Zone (PSZ) policy, nor the posting of revised PSZs on Rushmoor's website.

Rushmoor's response to the CAA's consultation, attached, raises key questions relating to the modelling process underpinning the Section 106 agreement. But these questions remain unanswered by the CAA.

As Rushmoor and the CAA are public authorities, does FAL accept that through the FACC this matter should be brought into the public domain?

Farnborough Airport Comment: Changes to the PSZ were made following the DfT./CAA consultation process and the Airport submitted revised maps to RBC/Harts and the CAA as obligated to do.

#### The Post Implementation Review (PIR)

Mr Geere's notes that the CAA has concluded that the ongoing effects of the pandemic on the use of airspace continues to result in a very different use of the airspace; and consequently the data collected over the last 18 months under CAP 725 or CAP 1626 would not adequately inform a review.

Whilst of general interest, this should have no bearing on Farnborough's PIR, that is unless the use of Farnborough's Cat D airspace is impacted by the level of scheduled air transport traffic at Heathrow or Gatwick. If so, can this be explained?

Last year the annual level of Farnborough's Business Aviation movements was in the order of 26000, and growth over the next 12 months to the level assumed for the environmental impact assessment, 32,000, cannot be discounted.

Farnborough Airport Comment: The Airport has received confirmation on the next stages of the ACP PIR from the CAA last Friday, 18<sup>th</sup> February, (as the CAA promised to do last Oct) and the CAA have updated their website accordingly. We are looking to put the link on our Website today and then mention this at this week's FACC.

GM February 2022.



PSZ (003).pdf

## Appendix 3 - Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public

### Question asked by Cllr Bob McShee on behalf of a Resident in Worplesdon

Dear Cllr McShee,

A note to bring you up to date on Farnborough related activities.

I sent the email below to Richard Moriarty, CEO of CAA. He had a colleague, Philip Clarke, reply in a long letter which answered little but gave one piece of new information.

All PIRs of outstanding ACPs have been on hold to avoid distortions due to the effect of the pandemic on traffic volumes. The CAA feels it is now time to restart the PIR process and they write –

'Sponsors of ACPs should commence data collection from 27 March 2022. A phased approach to commencement of data collection may be taken by sponsors to take account of resourcing requirements. Therefore, commencement of data may be initiated at any point between the 27 March 2022 and 27 September 2022. In all cases the CAA would require that 12 months of data is collected.'

It seems that the decision on when to start data collection is down to the sponsor. I am querying this with the CAA in view of the urgency that was previously put into starting this PIR because of the circumstances around the grant.

Please ask the FACC - *When, after 27 March 2022 will FAL start data gathering for the PIR?*

The letter from Mr Clarke says that the data to be collected is set out in appendix H of CAP 1616. This is an extensive list occupying four pages, but the whole list is headed 'potential data requirements'. To me, 'potential' means they could collect any or none of the data listed. I'm asking the CAA again to confirm that the data I listed in my email to Mr Moriarty will be collected and to say what additional data the CAA will ask to be collected.

Please ask the FACC - *'What data will FAL collect and will it include?*

*Annual picture of non-FAL GA flights per year before and after implementation in and under FAB CAS and for 6 miles outside it*

*Number of noise complaints in 2019 and in the PIR year*

*A statistical analysis and picture by altitude and position of Runway 24 arrivals through CTA1 and CTR2 since implementation?'*

The last item will give valuable information on the heights of arrivals to runway 24. These represent the majority of arrivals as runway 24 is used when the prevailing westerly wind blows. These arrivals can travel over Ash, Normandy, Wood Street and Guildford en-route to their FAF (Final Approach Fix - for an instrument landing) point over Pirbright ranges

If you need any further information ahead of the FACC meeting, please email or phone.

Best regards,

Mr R Partridge – Worplesdon

## Appendix 3 - Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public

### Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public.

#### Members Questions

Hugh Sheppard - 'My interpretation of recent responses to questions about the height of Farnborough incoming or outgoing aircraft above the Surrey AONB amounts to neither NATS nor FAL's ATC taking any responsibility for implementing the preferred height of above 7,000 ft as set out in Air Navigation Guidance. Is that correct?

Ian Dickson -NATS, responded neither FAL nor Farnborough ATC dictate the routings of arriving/departing aircraft, instead, these were laid out during the SID/STAR designs.

Ian did say, he did not know if AONB's were taken into consideration when designing ACP. He will speak with relevant parties within NATS to gain further insight into this.

**Action: Ian Dickson NATS to review and respond to Question from H Sheppard.**

Ian Dickson provided the following written response:

As promised, I have researched the ACP vs AONB debate, and come-up with the following:

During the ACP, efforts were made to move tracks over 'military ground' (24 Departure) and avoid overflight of both major population centres like Guildford and smaller affected communities such as Church Crookham and Crondall.

Bear in mind, ACP was about compromise, being pinned between Heathrow and Lasham with Blackbushe to the north really did mean the only area to operate tracks was south of the field.

In the CAA's CAP1678- Farnborough Airspace Change Proposal document, it was stated 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.*' (Page 27, para 71) and that '*The Runway 06 SID crosses the Surrey Hills AONB. Current departures already cross this AONB, but the vertical profile of aircraft using the Runway 06 SID means that it is expected that aircraft will be higher than current departures as they cross this location.*' (Page 29, para 80).

I believe that the CAA's Air Navigation Guidance (2017) was current during the ACP, which set out a list of altitude-based priorities, placing overflying AONB's near the bottom (5 out of 6) (see below)-

## Altitude Based Priorities

- 3.2 To assist the CAA and sponsors, the government laid out the altitude-based priorities which should be taken into account when considering the potential environmental impact of airspace changes. These priorities are intended solely to inform those responsible for considering and deciding permanent changes to the UK's airspace design (section 2.1(a) of this guidance) and not for day to day operations.
- 3.3 Noise from aircraft flying at or above 4,000 feet is less likely to affect the key noise metrics used for determining adverse effects and as aircraft continue to climb above this altitude their noise impact reduces. Set against this, there is also a need to secure an efficient use of airspace and to ensure that aircraft operations emissions are minimised. So when considering requests to change the airspace design, the CAA should apply the following altitude-based priorities of the government:
- a. in the airspace from the ground to below 4,000 feet the government's environmental priority is to limit and, where possible, reduce the total adverse effects on people;
  - b. where options for route design from the ground to below 4,000 feet are similar in terms of the number of people affected by total adverse noise effects, preference should be given to that option which is most consistent with existing published airspace arrangements;

17

- 
- c. in the airspace at or above 4,000 feet to below 7,000 feet, the environmental priority should continue to be minimising the impact of aviation noise in a manner consistent with the government's overall policy on aviation noise, unless the CAA is satisfied that the evidence presented by the sponsor demonstrates this would disproportionately increase CO<sub>2</sub> emissions;
  - d. in the airspace at or above 7,000 feet, the CAA should prioritise the reduction of aircraft CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and the minimising of noise is no longer the priority;
  - e. where practicable, it is desirable that airspace routes below 7,000 feet should seek to avoid flying over Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and National Parks; and
  - f. all changes below 7,000 feet should take into account local circumstances in the development of the airspace design, including the actual height of the ground level being overflown, and should not be agreed to by the CAA before appropriate community engagement has been conducted by the sponsor.

**The information and detail provided above covers a number of related issues; to summarise:**

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

The CAA's Air Navigation Guidance (2017) clearly provides 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 detailed before, the vast majority of flights that 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 from Hugh Sheppard, 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.

Ian Dickson – NATS March 2022.

## Appendix 3 - Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public

### Questions from Colin Shearn - Farnborough Noise

- 1) There are currently 32,000 movements a year with an average of 2.4 people per flight (FAL data). Assuming people take return flights and there are probably many people taking several flights a year (as their preferred method of travel), there are potentially only 2 – 5,000 people using the airport at the expense of hundreds of thousands of people. Please provide a distribution of the number of individuals flying and their frequency of flights to determine how many individuals are contributing to the total number of flights. The data would look something like this:

Commercial flight profile (excluding flying club & calibration flights)																
Profile A																
Number of movements	Empty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
Number of people	-	300	500	700	800	750	500	200	100	50	40	30	20	10	5	4,005
People movements	15,000	300	1,000	2,100	3,200	3,750	3,000	1,400	800	450	400	330	240	130	70	32,170
Profile B																
Number of movements	Empty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
Number of people	-	50	75	100	150	175	200	250	300	400	300	200	75	50	10	2,335
People movements	15,000	50	150	300	600	875	1,200	1,750	2,400	3,600	3,000	2,200	900	650	140	32,815

Response: FAL does not disclose this information.

- 2) What was the percentage of empty flights for 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022 to date by month?

Response: FAL does not disclose this information.

- 3) What is the list of departure and arrival destinations for Farnborough flights during 2019, 2020 and 2021 (by destination by year). Please exclude empty positioning flights.

Response: FAL does not disclose this information.

- 4) May we please have the email address for the Chairman of Macquarie Group Limited. It is unclear who the ultimate owner of Farnborough Airport Limited is (MIRA6 Fund or Macquarie Asset Management). This could be Peter H. Warne as shown on the website as Independent Chairman.

Response: FAL does not disclose this information.

- 5) If Farnborough Airport is owned by Macquarie and the Independent Chairman is indeed Peter H. Warne, can FAL explain the sustainability statements made by Macquarie (<https://www.macquarie.com/au/en/perspectives/climate-change.html>) and the fact that Peter H. Warne sits on the New South Wales Net Zero Emissions and Clean Economy Board.

Answers: FAL does not disclose this information.

- 6) How and when will FAL (as the sponsor) consult with stakeholders regarding the scope, timing and process of the PIR?

Response: FAL is not undertaking any consultation in this regard.

- 7) Which stakeholders will FAL consult with (many organisations and groups have been requesting they are engaged and a complete list should be provided to ensure relevant stakeholders are not missed).

Response: FAL is not undertaking any consultation.

- 8) What has the uptake of Sustainable Aviation Fuel been (previously reported as "poor" by FAL)? Is it understood that the supply of Neste SAF is not "sustainable"? (Note: Neste's raw materials are waste cooking oil and animal fat that are not renewable and already in limited supply as all available feedstock is used by the automotive industry for biofuels).

Response: FAL does not disclose this information.

- 9) A question was previously asked and answered by FAL "Q7B. How much did FAL pay for the carbon credits retired in 2019 to meet its offset requirements via Verra?" Response: "The 2019 offset was 1,700t at a cost of £15,300 (which included additional costs for planting 1700 trees locally, in addition to the official offset)". This valued CO2 at £9/t. The latest BEIS value for carbon abatement is £240/t. How will FAL provide carbon abatement at the current value?

Response: FAL acquires its carbon offsets through certified schemes.

- 10) Pollution recorded at the various monitoring stations reported by RBC exceed the World Health Organisation safe levels and are higher than the maximum PM2.5 levels fixed in November 2021 in the Environment Act. How much of the pollution recorded by the monitoring stations is caused by FAL operations (including aircraft that contribute to this pollution)?

Response: FAL does not disclose this information.

- 11) Will Simon Geere, as Chief Executive of Farnborough Airport, conduct and attend a public consultation meeting in Churt as part of the Post Implementation Review? (Question from Churt group).

Response: FAL is not undertaking any consultation as part of the PIR process.

- 12) It appears from the CAA proposal (<https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=434>) that some aircraft leaving Farnborough are breaching Class E controlled airspace. This is obviously a safety concern. How many times has this occurred by month since February 2020 when the ACP was introduced?

Response: The issue arises when aircraft do not climb at sufficient rate to achieve 4500ft by reporting point ASLAP. 4500ft or higher ensures that aircraft stay inside Class E airspace. This has seldom occurred, however, we identified a potential trend and therefore implemented a mitigation to increase the safety of the operation.

- 13) "The increase to 50,000 flight pa was agreed following an appeals process. The report addressed to the Secretaries of State for Communities and Local Government and Transport compiled by the appointed Planning Inspectorate stated unequivocally that "The range of prediction for job creation at 50,000 movements is 960 (RBC) -1880 (TAG). While I accept that the higher figure should be treated with caution, I nevertheless consider that the potential for creation of even 960 jobs (RBC forecast of new jobs at 50,000 BATMs), many of which would occur in Rushmoor and the locality, would be a significant benefit to the local economy to which I attach substantial weight". The Secretary of State (Department of Transport) made specific reference to this statement when granting planning permission albeit attaching "significant weight". In view of the importance attached to the economic benefits when granting the planning permission, what reporting and reassurances has the FACC requested and received to date to ensure these economic benefits come into effect?

Response: It is not the role of the FACC to impose 'reporting' and or seek 'reassurances' from the Airport in support of planning approvals. It is the role of the FACC to consult with the all stakeholders as defined in the Terms of Reference of the Constitution.

The Airport and RBC are to review and revise the original The Economic Impact of Business Aviation at Farnborough Airport Report completed by RBC in May 2009.



## Appendix 4

Simon Geere suggested Members read the following Sections From the CAA PIR Document.



PIR.pdf



PIRa.pdf

