

## FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON

9<sup>th</sup> February 2023

Held Physically at Hart DC and Online with MS Teams.

#### In Attendance:

Philip Whittacre	Riley Hope	Chairman Secretary
Chris	Dorn	Hart District Council
Simon	Geere	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Gareth	Andrews	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Rod	Cooper	Hampshire County Council
Alex	Culley	NATS
Les	Freer	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Geoff	Marks	FARA
James	Radley	Hart District Council
Jenny	Radley	Fleet & Church Crookham Society
Gareth	Saunders	Church Crookham Parish Council - <b>Online</b>
Bill	Cole	Ash Parish Council
Maurice	Sheehan	Rushmoor Borough Council - <b>Online</b>
David	Lewis	Surrey County Council - <b>Online</b>
Wally	Epton	WJE Associates
Duncan	Rae	Dassault Aviation Group Ltd - <b>Online</b>
Jules	Crossley	Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth
David	Munro	Waverley Borough Council
Sarah	Kingsley	Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut - <b>Online</b>
John	Redpath	Guildford Borough Council - <b>Online</b>
Sarah	Goldsack	Farnborough International Ltd - <b>Online</b>

#### Guests:

Ross	McNally	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce - <b>Online</b>
Hugh	Sheppard	CPRE Hampshire - <b>Online</b>
Pete	Rafano	Envirosuite (presenter)
Rachel	Thomas	Farnborough Airport Ltd (presenter)
Mark	Sanderson	Farnborough Airport Ltd (presenter)
Richard	Ward	Rushmoor Borough Council

**Participation: 20 FACC Members were present.**

## Introduction

This was the first time the FACC had held a meeting in the Council Chamber at Hart DC. The Committee was welcomed by Cllr James Radley and Cllr Chris Dorn, the two representatives of Hart DC on the Committee. The Chairman expressed his gratitude, thanked the councillors and the Facilities Staff who have worked with the FACC and Farnborough Airport in arranging the day.

### Item 1 Apologies Received:

Virginia Barrett	Farnborough College of Technology
Bob McShee	Guildford Borough Council
Ben Gleeson	Farnborough International
Paul Taylor	Rushmoor Borough Council
Marwan Khalek	GAMA Aviation
Colin Gray	Fleet & Church Crookham Society
Norman Lambert	Crondall Parish Council

The Secretary informed the Committee that Cllr Gary Bredin of Ewshot PC has stood down from the FACC and is to be replaced with Cllr Deirdre Rook. Cllr Rook had submitted her apologies as she could not attend.

### Statement from the Chairman.

*Perhaps not stated clearly, this statement and the following discussion were intended to address the comments and concerns raised by a Member on behalf of Colin Shearn, as circulated ahead of the meeting and attached at Appendix 2.*

1. Over the last few weeks there has been an avalanche of criticism of the way this committee is run, mainly emanating from two sources. I believe that I have always chaired this Committee in a way that gives everyone a fair opportunity to speak and to ask questions. I also feel that the Committee conducts its business essentially in compliance with DfT Guidelines although it is not obliged to do so (it is not a S.35 airport)
2. If the Committee is to function effectively, it must rely on the full co-operation of Farnborough Airport Limited which has supported the Committee since its inception in 2003. I believe that the Committee should make every effort to sustain that relationship.
3. Farnborough has always enabled the public to ask questions at its meetings but, regrettably, this facility has been abused and it has become increasingly difficult to complete the business of the meeting. It was therefore essential that the time allotted to public questions had to be controlled. The alternative would have been to exclude public questions, which is the case with some airports.
4. The Committee reviewed its constitution about a year ago and adopted a new constitution in November 2021. At the same time, it also expanded its membership to include two District Councils, a parish Council and an environmental group. I believe that, in geographical terms, the members of the Committee represent most if not all the areas adjacent to the airport which are over-flown by Farnborough traffic.
5. We must remember that air traffic density in the SE of England is probably one of the highest in Europe (LHR, LGW, STN, Luton, Biggin Hill, RAF Odiham etc.) If you live in the SE you will experience air traffic.

6. In the Consultation Feedback Report which followed the extensive consultation prior to the introduction of the Airspace Change, it was stated that 24% fewer people would be affected by Farnborough noise. However, a smaller number of people would be likely to get overflowed more often because flightpaths would be more concentrated. The Feedback Report can be found on the CAA Farnborough Airport Airspace Change website.
7. The Chairman suggested it may be a good addition to the Committee if there was a Deputy Chairman. The Constitution has no provision for this but asked the Members to give this some thought and provide the Secretary with any suggestions they may have on the subject or potential candidates.

**There was a lengthy discussion:**

Every Member that spoke, with one exception, confirmed they had every confidence in the Chairman and the way in which the FACC was managed.

James Radley – Hart DC was concerned the public were being excluded from the meetings but understood why. The public should be able to attend but clearly had to behave in an appropriate manner.

David Munro – Waverly BC and Jules Crossley BVFoE agreed. J Crossley asked if there should be more than 3 meetings a year and if the FACC should introduce specialist sub-committees?

Rod Cooper -Hampshire CC said the last meeting had been a shambles, those that misbehave or do not follow the rules, should be banned.

Bill Cole – Ash PC Felt the FACC had it right. The Members are there to represent the public so the public do not need to attend.

The Chairman pointed out the FACC follows the DfT Guidelines on public access. Many Consultative Committees do not allow the public any access. This will be a subject to the CAA Consultation on CC's. The Chairman then read out the current list of consultations being undertaken.

This initiated a discussion about whether the FACC should submit evidence to the CAA collectively or as individuals.

The meeting concluded it would unlikely Members would reach consensus on a number of issues so if they wanted to participate, they should do so on their own. If it was a consultation where there was likely to be a consensus then yes, the FACC should submit a joint position to the CAA.

Jules Crossley asked if there was going to be a vote on establishing a noise sub-committee or public access?

The Chairman – Read out the numerous CAA consultations out for response and suggested it may be better to make a decision following the consultation on consultative committees.

Chris Dorn – Said the meeting Chamber at Hart DC could be enlarged to allow members of the public to attend but he would have to agree any logistics and security issues with Hart Facilities.

Chris Dorn – Felt the FACC could end up with a number of sub-committees and this would not be a good thing.

Geoff Marks-FARA Could understand only a few Members had any technical expertise and the time to participate in a separate sub-committee so perhaps this should be done informally with some form of feedback to the Committee.

**Action: Members to provide their thoughts on Public access at FACC Meetings. Please see Appendix 3.**

**Action: For information at this stage, Chris Dorn will establish and provide Hart DC regulations on Public access to the Chamber.**

**Item 2. Minutes of Meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2022 – Actions and Matters Arising.**

The Minutes of the meeting had been circulated to members.

Actions from the Meeting please see Appendix 1.

All Actions have been completed, thanks to all contributors.

Minutes were approved subject to agreed corrections in Item on pages 2 and 3 being made at the request of Jenny Radley.

**Matters arising from the minutes:**

There were none on this occasion.

**Item 3. Farnborough Airport Information Report – Simon Geere.**

December 2022 year-end Reported ATMs closed up c27% against 2021 at 32,598. This resulted in 2022 being c3% up on 2019 levels and a new high for the airport.

Overall market share declined however from 34% in 2021 to 31% in 2022, due to the Airshow in July which tends to disrupt normal flight activity and also due to the weekend and public holiday movement cap of 8,900 allowable ATMs.

From May 2022, movement constraints were implemented at the airport to ensure weekend flying activity remained within the permitted levels.

The combined effect, based upon the observed decline in market share, suggests c2,000-3,000 flights were diverted to other UK/London airports.

On other matters, Farnborough Airport won the FBO (Fixed Base Operation) of the year award from the Air Charter Association in November. This sits alongside the Aviation International News (AIN) award best Business Aviation airport outside of the US won last May.

Construction work on the £55m third hangar, Domus III, continues and is still scheduled for completion in early 2024. FAL is working to attract new based operators to occupy the hangar.

Rushmoor published an update to the Economic Impact Assessment of Farnborough Airport originally undertaken by consultants Lichfield in 2009. The study has found that the airport has created many more jobs and economic benefits than they previously forecast.

Lichfield find that over 3,000 jobs are either directly or indirectly supported by the airport. This means that for every 100 flights, 10 jobs are supported by the airport. The report is due to be reviewed by the RBC's Overview and Scrutiny Committee this evening.

FAL welcomes the report and is likely to build on this study and make its own assessment of the economic benefits of the airport in due course.

The annual review and updates of 4 key policies were recently submitted and approved by the FAL board, these are: Sustainability Policy (Aviator and FAL), Environmental Policy (FAL), Energy Policy (FAL), Sustainable Procurement Policy (FAL). These policies are all available on the FAL website.

A new FAL website has been relaunched as is now up and running.

Media briefings took place on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> February with press representatives from a mixture of trade and national outlets. FAL announced its ATM performance for 2022 and also provided an update on a number of development initiatives including Domus III and its website, as well as referencing the Economic Impact Study by Lichfields.

FAL is pleased to announce that The Farnborough Airport Company (Airport and Aviator) is now a certified Great Place to Work and is hoping to make the national listings in line with its strategy to be an Employer of Choice and Responsibility in the region.

A Career's open day was held on 23<sup>rd</sup> January as part of the UK Government's initiative entitled Generation Aviation which was well attended by business partners and students.

The Aviator Hampshire hotel continues to perform well, with average occupancy for the rolling 12-month period January 2022 – December 2022 was 81%, which compared to the local market of 66%. The Farnborough Airport Company continues to follow the Real Living Wage Employer policy having been introduced from 1<sup>st</sup> Jan 2022.

Other updates, particularly around noise shall be given in the main agenda items of today's meeting.

**Questions arising:**

Jules Crossley – Asked for clarification about whether the weekend flight movement limit for 2022 had been over the permitted limit.

Simon Geere - Explained that the number of 'reported' flights was within the limit. That was followed by a brief discussion about other aviation flight movements that are not limited by planning permission.

Jules Crossley – Said she had been told that Simon had been quoted at a media briefing to say airspace change (ACP) was a way to increase weekend flights.

Simon Geere – Said he had never said that. (SG inherited the ACP when the Macquarie Group acquired FAL).

Geoff Marks – Asked if FAL was going to increase weekend flights cap?

Simon Geere – Responded, the weekend flying cap had been reached in 2022 as a result of a number of unexpected factors. He hoped the profile in 2023 would be smoother so the cap was unlikely to be reached.

Jenny Radley – Fleet & Church Crookham Society -Said, if there ever was an application to increase weekend flight movements, would FAL please keep the Committee and the Public updated and informed.

David Munro – Asked why the mobile noise equipment was not being deployed effectively as required by the Section 106.

Simon Geere – Stated there was no specific requirement under the S106 for FAL to physically handover the mobile noise monitoring equipment to members of the public. He indicated the matter would be discussed in later slides.

#### **Item 4. Farnborough Airport Reports – Gareth Andrews**

The Reports were circulated ahead of the meeting and taken as read.

##### **Questions arising:**

Jenny Radley – Thanked FAL for presenting some of the data in another way and bringing in more detail. She felt more improvements could be applied and asked Gareth if she could sit down with him to discuss further. Gareth welcomed this request.

**Action: Jenny Radley to meet Gareth Andrews to discuss whether more detail could be introduced.**

This initiated a discussion; regarding the number of complaints, what caused them, how complaints were addressed and responded to and if FAL suggested the complainant could contact their representative on the FACC?

David Munro – Observed that 100% of complaints appeared to be responded to/classified as compliant flights. Was he reading this correctly?

Gareth Andrews – Responded, he has.

James Radley – Said, residents are annoyed they are being told their complaints are not complaints.

Jules Crossley – Public feel the increase in complaints is down to ACP.

Les Freer – Said this would be discussed later in the meeting.

#### **Item 5. Airspace Change – Post Implementation Review Update.**

**Rachel Thomas – FAL and Pete Rafano - Envirosuite**

Please see slide presentation: 1. FACC; PIR & AMS (part 1).

**Questions arising:**

James Radley – Asked how much freedom does the airport have to design its own airspace?

Rachel Thomas - Responded all airspace changes are governed by the principles laid down by the CAA and the DfT. Working within this, airports do have a degree of flexibility however they also have to work with other airports whose airspace adjoins their own.

Davis Munro – Asked about Post Implementation Review (PIR) timing. Rachel went back to the slides.

**Item 6. Airspace Modernisation Strategy Engagement Session Update and Next Steps  
Rachel Thomas – FAL and Pete Rafano – Envirosuite.**

Please see slide presentation: 1. FACC; PIR & AMS (part 2).

**Item 7. Complaints Handling Proposals; (Webtrak & Airport Noise Monitoring Systems (ANOMS)  
Pete Rafano – Envirosuite.**

Please see slide presentation: 1. FACC; PIR & AMS (part 3).

This presentation was followed by a brief discussion about the 30 minute delay on the Webtrak system, as compared to some other flight movement sites that were able to provide instant information.

Pete Rafano – Responded that the 30 second delay is a regulation imposed by the UK Government through the DfT TRANSEC. (The aim of TRANSEC is to protect the travelling public, transport facilities and those working in transport primarily from terrorist acts, and to retain public confidence in transport security.)

**Item 8. Vexatious Complaints Discussion – Gareth Andrews  
(Complaints Statistics and Complaints Handling Proposals).**

Please see slide presentation: 2. FACC; Airport Complaints (Statistics).

As mentioned earlier, Les Freer took up the subject of noise monitoring.

FAL was undertaking a review of all previous noise commitments and took an action to summarise these at the next meeting.

**Action: Les Freer will summarise previous noise commitments and revert with proposed actions plan.**

There was a lengthy discussion on the subject of noise monitoring.

Rachel Thomas – Said work would need to be undertaken to assess any potential noise monitoring sites and then to structure a monitoring programme.

### **Questions arising:**

Jules Crossley – Asked if all the noise complaints received during PIR would be submitted to the CAA.

Rachel Thomas – Answered yes it would.

Geoff Marks - Asked if FAL would brief him on the latest review of noise metrics.

Gareth Andrews – Said he would be happy to assist.

Chris Dorn – Commented that looking at the numbers of complaints lodged this must have a distorting effect on any analysis. How expensive was a noise monitor?

Pete Rafano – The ones likely used would cost about £10K.

James Radley – Explained the ‘Leaky Bucket ‘Algorithm’ which, in his view, explains why the tolerance levels for those who experience no disturbance from a number of flights overhead over a short period of time, but after which every flight can cause annoyance or distress.

Jenny Radley -Suggested that residents are likely to be disturbed more by aircraft noise during evenings, weekends and bank holidays when residents are more likely to be at home. There is also a seasonal aspect because they will have windows and doors open in the warmer and sunnier months.

Chris Dorn – Agreed and suggested more innovation be applied to the reporting. He also asked if Members could receive details of the complaints in their areas?

Simon Geere – Said FAL would look at this again, subject the GDPR restrictions.

Les Freer – Said it was important to concentrate on real complaints. The quantities of complaints being submitted made this difficult. Some residents were gaming the system.

Some Members felt this statement would annoy residents.

Bill Cole - Ash Parish Council and Chris Dorn – Agreed those gaming the system should be sought out to allow genuine complaints to receive the correct level of attention.

Gareth Andrews went back to the slides.

Please see slide presentation: 3. FACC; Complaints Charter.

There was then a discussion on vexatious complaints. Gareth pointed out how the concentration of complaints had moved, had increased dramatically in 2021 and 2022 after airspace change and how three residents were responsible for 66% and the top 10 complainants were responsible for 90% of all complaints.

Simon Geere – Said FAL had submitted a proposed change to the complaints section of the S106 last year. He said he regretted doing this without consulting the FACC, so had withdrawn it in November to allow this discussion.



Gareth Andrews – Added most local organisations including RBC applied vexatious complaints clauses and read out instructions that can be found on the Churt Parish Council website. Please see Appendix 4.

Simon Geere – Said FAL would re-submit the application and would appreciate thoughts and comments from Members ahead of this. He asked if Members would please provide their suggestions and comments by **28<sup>th</sup> February** to the FACC Secretary.

Jenny Radley – Asked when would FAL submit the planning amendment?

Simon Geere – Shortly after that. The usual RBC planning process would then commence.

**Action: Members to submit comments, suggestions and proposed text for the application to RBC to establish a vexatious complaints exclusion in FAL planning permission, to Simon or the Secretary.**

**Item 9. DfT Consultation on UK Airports Consultative Committees.**

The Chairman told the Committee the DfT Consultation on Consultative Committees would be published shortly. The FACC did submit feedback to UKACC in January 2022.

The Chairman suggested the Report could be discussed at the next meeting in June.

**Item 10 Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public**

Question from Cathy Murrell, BVFoE, and Farnborough Resident put forward by Jules Crossley. Regarding Air Quality and Behaviour of the FACC. See Appendix 5.

Not mentioned at the meeting - FAL operates air quality monitoring as per the UK government guidelines and reports on this biannually to RBC. Reports can be found on RBC's website.

Question from a local Environment Group put forward by Jules Crossley. Regarding Carbon Offsetting. See Appendix 6

Mark Sanderson - FAL – Responded – FAL 's Net Zero pathway as outlined in its Roadmap to Net Zero by 2030. FAL will reduce our Scope 1 and 2 emissions (owned emissions) by 91%, leaving residual emissions of less than 200 tonnes of carbon equivalent (inclusive of the Aviator Hotel). Offsetting will be used to address these residual emissions.

A Question from Hugh Sheppard – Odiham resident & CPRE Hampshire Regarding FAL Net Zero Roadmap. See Appendix 7.

Hugh Shepard spoke to his question.

Mark Sanderson - FAL responded –FAL uses tonnes of CO2 per MTOW (maximum take-off weight) of the aircraft flown as the most relevant metric for measuring its carbon emissions. Per passenger metrics do not quantify absolute levels of carbon and are easily distorted by the introduction of larger aircraft carrying more passengers and emitting more carbon overall.

Simon Geere – Stated for the record, that the Tempus magazine article had not given correct passenger numbers as background information. FAL holds the view that such a metric was not relevant for managing performance because larger flights with more passengers could be encouraged which would improve the measure but would result in more emissions. FAL instead

uses carbon emissions per flown tonne (based upon the MTOW (maximum take-off weight) of the aircraft) which it believes is a more relevant metric for managing emissions performance.

Hugh Sheppard - Said no-one was suggesting larger aircraft or scheduled services to reduce per capita emissions, but users of the airport have no idea of their individual carbon footprint, while FAL does have that data but chooses not to use it. Such collective data could show future improvements from hydrogen or electric powered aircraft, etc. but instead these emissions are treated as nothing to do with FAL - and they are.

Simon Geere - Said FAL's Roadmap shows MTOW as the most appropriate metric. The metric will more accurately reflect future improvements in aircraft technology without the distortion caused by varying passenger loads.

Hugh Sheppard - Asked if he was running a train, would the weight of the train be most relevant or the passenger numbers.

Simon Geere – If the target was to reduce the per passenger emissions of the train then he would sell more tickets cheaply to more people. The emissions per passenger would improve but the absolute emissions would increase, as the train would have a heavier weight to pull.

Hugh Sheppard - Said individual emissions would then go down, and FAL could do the same by investing in alternative means of propulsion. Instead FAL just says 'nothing to do with us'.

Simon Geere - Refuted that because the Roadmap says a lot about it. The Roadmap assumes aircraft technology improves over time.

Hugh Sheppard - Said that was only for the 9% of airport-based emissions when it is the individual users who are responsible for all the airport and in-flight emissions.

James Radley - Reminded the meeting of Hart & Rushmoor Councils' 'Carbon Emergency' policies and the seriousness of these matters. Both Hart and Rushmoor and many other local councils, because climate change is a subject we all have to take very seriously. He said that as a global society we care about whether we can have individuals unfairly contributing to our carbon footprint and Mr. Sheppard makes a very legitimate point. He concluded by saying while this was a serious matter he did not think it was an issue for the FACC.

The Chairman - Said this was an important discussion that had made some valid points.

Simon Geere - Said that FAL is committed to leading in aviation sustainability.

Hugh Sheppard - Said he wished to see the information in FAL's possession more in the open between FAL and the FACC, also referring SG to the 'Polluter Pays principle'.

Simon Geere - Reiterated his earlier quote from a Government policy directive, that a balance must be sought. He didn't see that as for the FACC, since the business need to travel is covered as a UK national matter.

Hugh Sheppard - Asked if Simon Geere would correct the passenger figure from Tempus Magazine.

Simon Geere - Understood the reason, but instead quoted TAG's CEO from the 2009 Planning Application that put 2.5 persons per flight into the public domain, which he had no reason to change.

Geoff Marks - Asked if FAL would agree to this number being used by the Committee, together with the data Hugh Sheppard had put forward.

Simon Geere - Said this would serve no purpose to FAL which would not be using it, but agreed the Committee was free to use it.

The Chairman thanked Hugh Sheppard for his question, saying this would have to be discussed in the future and the FACC would have to keep looking at it.

**Item 11 Matters raised by the Committee not on the Agenda.**

Jules Crossley referred back to the Webtrak discussion and asked when the flightpaths/swathes would be updated as mentioned by Rachel Thomas?

Rachel Thomas responded that it is hoped that the work currently being undertaken would be in place for the PIR 28-day public feedback period.

David Munro – Asked if it would be a good idea to hold a special FACC meeting to discuss PIR.

This was put to a vote. Not carried.

Rod Cooper – Thought having a vice chairperson was a good idea and should there be a vote on it?

The Chairman thought not but could Members put forward suggestions for the role, a discussion could be held at the next meeting.

**Action: Members to submit comments and suggestions regarding the position of Vice Chairman to the Secretary.**

The Secretary reminded Members to submit comments and suggestions with regard to the NEW website which has been circulated.

**Action: Members to submit comments and suggestions on the NEW website.**

Richard Ward – RBC undertook to respond to Geoff Marks on his latest PSZ question.

**Action: Richard Ward to respond the Geoff Marks PSZ questions.**

Jenny Radley – Requested for all the presentations to be made available to members and put on the FACC website. Many of the details provided are important and it would be useful to consider more carefully. Some had not been easy to read and digest during the meeting itself.

**Item 12 The next meetings of the Committee will take place on**

**Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2023 and**

**Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> October 2023.**

**Medium/Location to be advised.**

**The Meeting was declared closed.**

Approved

## Appendix 1.

### Actions from Meeting Held on Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> February 2023.

- Action 1:** Action: Members to provide their thoughts on Public access at FACC Meetings.
- Action 2:** For information at this stage, Chris Dorn will establish and provide Hart DC regulations on Public access to the Chamber.
- Action 3:** Jenny Radley to meet Gareth Andrews to discuss whether more detail could be introduced.
- Action 4:** Les Freer will summarise previous noise commitments and revert with proposed actions plan.
- Action 5:** Members to submit comments, suggestions and proposed text for the application to RBC to establish a vexatious complaints exclusion in FAL planning permission, to him or the Secretary.
- Action 6:** Members to submit comments and suggestions regarding the position of Vice Chairman to the Secretary.
- Action 7:** Members to submit comments and suggestions on the NEW website.
- Action 8:** Action: Richard Ward to respond the Geoff Marks PSZ questions.

## **Appendix 2.**

### **The Chairman Addresses Procedure and Operational Complaints from**

#### **Mr Shearn - Farnborough Noise Group and brought to the FACC by A Member.**

Dear Members,

Two members of the Committee have requested that Mr C Shearn of the Farnborough Noise Group should be given the opportunity to address the Committee on 9<sup>th</sup> February in person. I have declined this request for the reason set out below.

As you are aware, we have found it difficult, over the last 2 years, to conduct the meeting in an orderly fashion without interruption. Accordingly, at the meeting next week, I shall deal with public questions strictly in accordance with the procedure set out in Appendix 3 of the Constitution. It follows that if Mr Shearn wishes to ask a question, he should either provide 5 days' notice of the question or, if he prefers, he can ask the question at the appropriate point in the meeting. I should mention that Mr Shearn asked 80 questions in 2022 and made 589 complaints to the airport. I am assured that Farnborough Airport Ltd has either answered those questions (unless it was unwilling to do so on the grounds of commercial confidentiality) or will do so in due course.

Mr Shearn has also alleged that the Committee is not operated in accordance with the DfT's Guidelines for Airport Consultative Committees. I enclose a note sent to us by Mr Shearn which sets out the reasons in support of his view. It is, of course, a matter for members of the Committee to consider whether they are satisfied with the way the Committee is organised and conducts its business but, as your Chairman, I am always very willing to discuss matters that concern you and to propose any changes that you feel may be required.

I should also mention that the publication of DfT's review of Airport Consultative Committees is imminent so that should hopefully provide us with an opportunity to review the way that we conduct our business.

**Philip Riley**

**Chairman FACC**

## **Challenge to the FACC regarding the operation and effectiveness of the FACC**

Questions to FAL and NATS from the public are supposed to be answered between FACC meetings. This is not happening and many questions that have been submitted over recent years have either been ignored or the information provided has nothing to do with the question submitted. As a result, an increasing number of questions have had to be submitted to the FACC. Questions submitted to the FACC have not been answered either. I think everyone will agree that the way that the past four FACC meetings have operated is not acceptable. Regarding February's meeting, the chair has unilaterally decided that the public will only be able to watch proceedings via YouTube. The new procedure effectively excludes the public who, according to the constitution, are allowed to ask questions of the committee in meetings.

Groups like the Farnborough Noise Group represent a large number of people who can't attend meetings in the middle of the working day and who consolidate questions from hundreds of people – yet they can only submit one question. The agenda for each FACC meeting is only published after the closing date to submit questions via a FACC member has passed.

Meetings are a very poor use of time as topics like noise complaints should be handled in a sub-group and the airport's update sent out as pre-reading rather than read out verbatim in the meeting. Some members of the committee do not seem to have the knowledge of aviation and the noise, emissions and pollution issues being raised to the FACC, nor do they contribute to discussions. As a result, the FACC has become nothing more than a voice for Farnborough Airport.

The view from many groups and members of the public that are involved with Farnborough Airport and the FACC is that the FACC is failing in its obligation to fairly represent the interests of all stakeholders and to communicate openly and effectively with communities. That is not a criticism of many of the councillors and community representatives who give their time to the FACC but a failure of administration and management of the FACC.

The FACC is directed by government guidelines (Guidelines for Airport Consultative Committees 2014). The FACC is not compliant with these guidelines. These points were raised two years ago and they have not been addressed. The public should not have to battle with the FACC to get their voices heard, it should be independent and fairly representing the interests of all parties. A properly functioning FACC was critical during the PIR that is coming to a close and with the national Airspace Modernisation Strategy that has started. The issue of the FACC's role will be raised in the meeting on 17th March with MPs, the DfT and the CAA.

The government's guidelines state in section 3.21 "Disputes involving members of the committee or the working of the committee should be handled within the committee in the first instance." The committee needs to address these issues immediately and properly and set a new way forward so that it is compliant with its obligations.

**Farnborough Noise Group 24th January 2023.**

## Appendix 3.

### Members thoughts on Public Access

The Members were invited to submit their thoughts on public access to FACC Meetings following a discussion brought about through a question/complaint from Colin Shearn and responded to by the Chairman.

The FACC fully complies with the DfT Guidelines on Public Access to meetings and Public Questions.

The DfT does NOT mandate public access. Of the 32 consultative committees in the UK, a third permit no public access, a third allow public to attend online or in person but do not allow questions and a third allow public access with question time identical to the FACC.

The FACC Constitution was updated to reflect DfT, CAA and UKACC guidelines in 2022.

Until 2020 and the COVID lockdown, the FACC had permitted public access to meetings and allowed questions.

In the four meetings immediately prior to lockdown activists caused disruption and latterly a Police presence was in place to manage the situation.

The Chairman has always advocated public participation so long as it is well behaved and is limited to input at the appropriate section in the meeting.

Now that meetings can be viewed online is there a real requirement to be present?

#### ***The Members asked among other things to consider:***

Should the public be permitted to attend meetings in person or be limited to viewing online?

If Members feel the public should be allowed to attend in person, how would numbers be limited?

If Members feel the public should be allowed to attend in person, should DfT and the current FACC, guidelines be applied?

How will security be maintained to avoid the activist disruption seen previously?

Should the 'Question Time Procedures' contained in Appendix 3 of the Constitution be amended?

And others.....

Consultative Committees are not intended to be a public forum or general talking-shop.

Consultative Committees are a forum for representees of the public and other stakeholders, (the Members), to have a regular constructive dialogue with the airport, to understand what is happening and planned to happen, to relay and resolve Member's issues and a mechanism to hold the airport to account.



## Appendix 4

# Actions you can take

There are 3 types of actions for you to take. You can choose some (or all) of:

1. Write to those conducting the PIR to ask that the issues above are considered.

Farnborough Airport Ltd, Farnborough Airport, Farnborough, GU14 6XA  
email: [acp-pir@farnboroughairport.com](mailto:acp-pir@farnboroughairport.com)

2. Write to your MP to ask that they put pressure on the CAA for the above measures to be taken into account.

Jeremy Hunt: [huntj@parliament.uk](mailto:huntj@parliament.uk)

Damian Hinds: [damian.hinds.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:damian.hinds.mp@parliament.uk)

3. Complain about noisy flights:

by email: [complaints@farnboroughairport.com](mailto:complaints@farnboroughairport.com)

online: <https://webtrak.emsbk.com/fab>

Please copy in [farnboroughnoise@gmail.com](mailto:farnboroughnoise@gmail.com) so they can keep a separate record of complaints and coordinate.

**It is particularly important that we complain about as many Farnborough Airport related flights as possible until at least April 2023.** Without a regular stream of complaints from a wide variety of people, Farnborough Airport will claim that the public are content with the changes and the flightpaths will be set in stone which will be disastrous for the area as the airport ramps up its activities.

Template letters are available from [farnboroughnoise@gmail.com](mailto:farnboroughnoise@gmail.com)

## Appendix 5.

**Question from Cathy Murrell, BVFoE, and Farnborough Resident.**

**Put forward by Jules Crossley – Black Water Valley Friends of the Earth**

**RE: Air Quality and Behaviour of the FACC**

Dear Secretary,

I received the question below from a member of Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth who lives in Farnborough this morning. They are going to be out of the country when we have the meeting, so they can't attend this one in person or virtually - but I will report back and they can read the minutes of course.

The question is:

Having attended meetings of the FACC over the past 2 - 3 years I have become increasingly concerned about its ability to remain objective and to represent the views and concerns of the local community.

I am particularly concerned about air quality around the airport, for example, and I don't feel this matter has been sufficiently covered by FAL or the FACC. Can the Chair and members of the committee assure me, and other concerned residents, that they are able to represent the general public as effectively as they seem to represent the operator and users?

I hope the issue of the public being able to watch the meetings has also been resolved, and we will be able to attend the meetings virtually going forward?

Many thanks

JC

February 2023

**Farnborough Airport Ltd.** will respond at the meeting on the question about Air Quality.

**The FACC Chairman** - The FACC follows the DfT guidelines on the composition of Airport Consultative Committees. These require that the committee should represent 3 constituencies - airport users, local authorities and other organisations representing the locality in which the airport is situated. The FACC is entirely compliant with the guidelines in that we have an equal number of representatives of each group. When we reviewed the membership of the Committee just over a year ago, the total membership was increased and, in order to maintain the one third balance Blackwater Valley FoE was admitted as a member. It is not true to say that the Committee is biased in favour of the airport operators. Its membership reflects a broad spectrum of local interests.

## Appendix 6.

### Question from a local Environment Group.

#### Carbon Offsetting

Put forward by Jules Crossley – Black Water Valley Friends of the Earth

Dear Secretary,

I received the two articles below from a member of the public who is a member of a local environmental group, who is concerned about the potential lack of value of offsetting. They would like me to ask FAL to respond to the criticism that offsetting is largely valueless and therefore not an effective tool in achieving net-zero?

As you will see from the article regarding EasyJet's change of approach on this, many large airlines are moving away from using offsetting as part of their net-zero policy, or as a tool to help passengers offset the CO2 they're producing by flying.

I feel that the person who asked the question doesn't just want a response - they would appreciate some discussion, as I suspect would many members of the FACC. I think offsetting is something that we need more information about - and vitally, information from an independent source. Opinions around this seem to be evolving. I'm sure FAL will be able to give some specifics around the detail of how and where they offset. I also thought that information and further discussion about offsetting could potentially be covered in the talk on sustainable aviation.

<https://www.reuters.com/business/aerospace-defense/easyjet-shifts-focus-cut-own-emissions-rather-than-off-setting-2022-09-26/#:~:text=LUTON%2C%20England%2C%20Sept%2026%20%28Reuters%29%20-%20EasyJet%20%28EZJ.L%29,efficient%20aircraft%2C%20sustainable%20aviation%20fuel%20and%20operating%20improvements.>

Could I please ask: **In light of recent investigations and press coverage about the potential worthlessness of offsetting, could FAL please give details to explain how offsetting can realistically remain an effective part of their net-zero strategy?**

Regards,

Jules Crossley.

#### FAL Response:

The FACC Secretary forwarded your question about offsetting and asked for our thoughts and comments.

You are likely aware the Guardian article criticising offsetting was one side of the story. I have attached an article ([Verra Response to Guardian Article on Carbon Offsets - Verra](#)) in which is a link to the other side of the story from Verra, the world's leading standards for climate action and sustainable development.

Nevertheless, offsetting is not the focus of the FAL Net Zero Roadmap. FAL is actively investing in infrastructure/new technologies to ensure it meets its targets. As you are aware, Net Zero is about reducing your own emissions to as close to zero as possible, as opposed to just offsetting.

In response to your question, the UK Government and aviation industry do not currently feel offsetting is a *worthless* element. FAL will keep up to date with how a multitude of issues like these progress over time and make adjustments to its strategy where applicable.

Hopefully this is helpful in answering your question, do let me know if you need any additional information.

Mark Sanderson.

Group Corporate Responsibility Manager.

**Additional Question:**

As I understand it, the questioner would like an answer from FAL at the FACC meeting about how much they are relying on offsetting as part of their net-zero strategy.

FAL respond at the Meeting - FAL 's Net Zero pathway as outlined in our Roadmap to Net Zero by 2030 we will reduce our Scope 1 and 2 emissions (owned emissions) by 91%, leaving residual emissions of less than 200 tonnes of carbon equivalent (inclusive of the Aviator Hotel). Offsetting will be used to address these residual emissions.

## Appendix 7.

**A Question from Hugh Sheppard – Odiham resident & CPRE Hampshire**

**As requested by Geoff Marks – FARA**

FACC Meeting. 9 February 2023. Question from Hugh Sheppard: Farnborough Airport and Net Zero FAL's 'Roadmap to Net Zero by 2030' represents a staging post on Government's path towards its legal climate change objective of national 'Net Zero by 2050'.

In common with all other airports, the Roadmap sets out to show how FAL intends to decarbonise Farnborough's ground-based emissions, while acknowledging but not addressing, the associated in-flight emissions that represent more than 10 times the problem. With climate change as the biggest global pollution issue, I feel that this forum should discuss how FAL and the FACC deal with the responsibility.

Ten days ago, DEFRA published a policy paper on 'Environmental Principles' that will become binding on all Government departments later this year. It's a very important report that I hope FACC will circulate, embodying 5 principles that have already been adopted into government policy. The 4th principle is particularly relevant:

**'The polluter pays principle.**

Description: The polluter pays principle means that, where possible, the costs of pollution should be borne by those causing it, rather than the person who suffers the effects of the resulting environmental damage, or the wider community'.

The implication is that it is the users of Farnborough Airport who bear responsibility for the totality of the related emissions, ground-based and in-flight. It is their choice to use private aviation and the associated resources, among which even the Aviator hotel has already been incorporated into the Roadmap's tables.

Also, thanks to the 2019 Roadmap tables and a statement of passenger numbers for the same year by FAL's CEO, evidence is to hand in the public domain that offers the FACC and the Local Authority the opportunity to break down Farnborough Airport's emissions on a user per capita basis, including their Scope 3c in-flight emissions.

An outline of the basis for this has already been made available to FAL and could also be appended to the minutes. My own calculations suggest that the shared per capita responsibility of each private jet passenger taking a Farnborough Airport return flight in 2019, on the basis of all related emissions (including ground - based and positioning movements), had averaged CO2 emissions on a par with the annual emissions per capita of the average member of the UK population.

**My question + supplementary is:**

'In order that Farnborough Airport can be seen to progress decarbonisation in line with government's Net Zero strategy, does the FACC agree it would be helpful to establish a benchmark for the per capita emissions of airport users? If so, will FAL contribute to the analysis or prefer to leave it to others?

This appendix represents a digest of information from the public domain to support the following question + supplementary:

**'In order that Farnborough Airport can be seen to progress decarbonisation in line with government's Net Zero strategy, does the FACC agree it would be helpful to establish a benchmark for the per capita emissions of airport users? If so, will FAL contribute to the analysis or prefer to leave it to others?'**

FAL's Roadmap to Net Zero by 2030 policy paper as published in June 2022. **Website report may be downloaded from:** <https://netzero.farnboroughairport.com/>

**Government Policy Paper 'Environmental Principles' was updated on 31 January '23:**  
[www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-principles-policy-statement/](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-principles-policy-statement/)

'The 5 principles in this statement play an important role to support Environmental Improvement Plans and to delivering on our net zero commitment to tackle climate change.' These include the Polluter Pays Principle.

**FAL's Roadmap pages incorporate 2019 data and include:**

P5. Mention of the Aviator hotel, calculation on basis of CO<sub>2</sub>e and categorisation of emissions, including those of FAL 'Limited Influence' on aircraft in-flight above 3,000 ft. referenced as Scope 3c.

P6. Under 'Controllable emissions' FAL reports airports 'increasingly' estimate Scope 3c emissions of airlines and operators. Their omission from Airport calculations is explained.

P8. 'Relative Emissions Performance' tables set out such Scope 3c emissions as per P6, comparing F'boro's 119,000 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e with a Hub Airport (H'row) at 20 m. tonnes. Proportionately, the airport-based emissions are similar; 9% (F'boro) 10% (H'row).

From the P8 tables, the total of airport-related emissions can be assessed from the sum of Scopes 1, 2 & 3b (airport-based) and Scope 3c (in-flight) emissions.

P14. Roadmap words 'our absolute carbon emissions impact' are misplaced as this relates only to Airport emissions of 10,856 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e. However, the data offers the true total impact, enabling per capita emissions to be derived from the number of passengers.

Passenger numbers, quoted by FAL's CEO Simon Geere in Tempus Magazine, June 2021:  
<https://tempusmagazine.co.uk/news/interview-simon-geere-on-paving-the-way-for-sustainable-private-jet-travel-as-new-ceo-of-farnborough-airport>

*'Being the largest private jet airport in the UK, Farnborough saw 32,000 movements and 62,000 travellers in 2019'.*

Hence, from FAL's own data, the total emissions of private aviation at Farnborough can be assessed on a per capita basis in line with Government's Environmental Principles. Subject to corrections, caveats and confirmation, the 'Question' stands.

**Hugh Sheppard (CPRE Hampshire) 2 Feb 2023.**