

FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON
22nd June 2023
Held Physically at Hart DC and Online with MS Teams
And streamed Live on FACC/YouTube.**

In Attendance:

Philip Riley	Chairman
Whittacre Hope	Secretary
Local Authorities	
James Radley	Hart District Council
Chris Dorn	Hart District Council
Maurice Sheehan	Rushmoor Borough Council - Online
Rod Cooper	Hampshire County Council
David Lewis	Surrey County Council
David Munro	Waverly Borough Council
Martin Sullivan	Woking Borough Council
Local Interest Groups	
Geoff Marks	Farnborough Airport Resident Association
Jenny Radley	Fleet & Church Crookham Society
George Hesse	Farnham Town Council
John Ford	Church Crookham Parish Council
Jules Crossley	Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth
Users	
Simon Geere	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Les Freer	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Gareth Andrews	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Marwan Khalek	GAMA Aviation Ltd
Wally Epton	WJE Associates
Sarah Goldsack	Farnborough International - Online

Guest Speaker: Finlay Asher – From Safe Landing

<https://safe-landing.org/>

Guests:

Barry Smith	Basingstoke & District Business Strategy Group - Online
Ann-Marie Barker	Woking Borough Council - Online
Gareth Saunders	Church Crookham Parish Council
Hugh Sheppard	CPRE Hampshire – Online
Rachel Thomas	Farnborough Airport Ltd (presenter)
Matt Jago	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Aaron Fazal	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Kerry Baldwin	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Peter Russell	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mark Sanderson	Farnborough Airport Ltd
Richard Ward	Rushmoor Borough Council

Participation: 18 FACC Members were present.
4 Members of the public were present.
14 Viewers followed the live-stream.

These Minutes – From the Secretary.

This meeting was recorded and a link to this is available on the [FACC Website](#).
As there is a perfect record of what was said at this meeting, I will make these Minutes more concise than those that preceded these. I will still record the important points and actions taken.

Introduction

The Chairman opened the second FACC meeting in the Council Chamber at Hart DC, welcoming all attendees present and watching online, reminded everyone they were being recorded and with Chris Dorn completed the usual meeting administrative duties.

[From a technical perspective the Meeting worked very well, the MS Teams interface, the streaming through YouTube onto the FACC website and the link between these worked without fault. My thanks to Hart DC Facilities and FAL IT for all their support. FACC Sec]

Item 1 Apologies Received:

Gareth Williams	Rushmoor Borough Council
Virginia Barrett	Farnborough College of Technology
Alex Culley	NATS.
Ben Gleeson	Farnborough International
Mark Bates	Gulfstream Aerospace Ltd.
Joanne Goodall	TAG Aviation LTD
Norman Lambert	Crandall Parish Council
Leanne MacIntyre	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Carl Turner	Ewshot Parish Council
Richard Lucas	Ash Parish Council

The Secretary informed of changes to the Committee following the local elections:

FACC Members Changes

Cllr Carl Turner - Ewshot Parish Council - Replaces - Cllr Gary Bredin

Cllr George Hesse - Farnham Town Council - Replaces - Cllr John Scotty Fraser

Cllr Gareth Williams – RBC - Replaces - Cllr Paul Taylor.

Cllr Leanne MacIntyre – Surrey Heath Borough Council - Replaces - Cllr Helen Whitcroft

Cllr Richard Lucas – Ash Parish Council - Replaces - Cllr Bill Cole.

TBA – Guildford Town Council and Crondall Parish Council.

Item 2 Sustainable Aviation -A Talk by Findlay Asher – From Safe Landing.

Finlay joined from another appointment and so this slot moved down the order of the Agenda and took place after Item 6. The presentation from Finlay can be found on the FACC website.

Item 3. Minutes of Meeting held on 9th February 2023 – 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.

Geoff Marks – FARA Said he and Richard Ward of RBC, were content that they understand each other, and most importantly, that the Local Plan safety policy will continue to require the application of the annual individual risk model.

Minutes were approved subject to agreed corrections in Item 8 on page 8 being made at the request of Jules Crossley - Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth.

Matters arising from the minutes:

There were none on this occasion.

Matters arising from the actions:

While Members had commented on the suggestion of adding a Vice Chairman, no one suggested any potential candidates. The Chairman invited Members to do so and reiterated that the Vice Chairman role should be seen as succession planning for his own eventual retirement from the Committee. Therefore, suggestions should reflect this.

Action: Members to submit suggestions for the position of Vice Chairman to the Secretary.

Item 4. Farnborough Airport Chief Executive Update– Simon Geere.

Reportable ATMS (air traffic movements) YTD (year-to-date) for May are -12.4% down on 2022 levels, but +1.7% versus 2019. There are clear signs that the early part of last year benefited from the post-pandemic resurgence in travel due to the restrictions in the prior periods.

FAL overall market share declined from 34% in 2022 to 31% in 2023, however is broadly equivalent to the 2019 level of 32%.

From a general outlook perspective, FAL expect 2023 to be a more normalised traffic profile when compared to 2022.

On other matters, FAL won for the 17th time in a row the best FBO (Fixed Base Operator) outside of the Americas award from Aviation International News (AIN). FAL was also voted 65th in the UK as part of the Best Workplaces awards for large sized companies.

FAL is delighted that Aviator Hampshire Hotel was voted 7th best hotel in the UK on Tripadvisor 2023 Travellers Choice top 25.

Construction work on the £55m 3rd Hangar, Domus III, continues and is still scheduled for completion in early 2024. The steel frame is now virtually complete and the roof and side cladding is starting to be fitted. FAL is working to attract new based operators to occupy the hangar.

As some members of the FACC will have noted, FAL submitted a planning application for a standalone lounge facility for one of its key partners, FlexJet. This is all part of their strategy to enhance and differentiate their product offering. FAL and FlexJet have been working together to bring their European tactical control centre to FAL from North London and last year they relocated their operation bringing around 60 new jobs to the Borough.

Going forward FlexJet will be a welcome contributor to the economic growth story of the region. The application has just been approved by Rushmoor's Development Committee.

Jobs are obviously an important part of what FAL provides and it is working with other top operators to secure a larger presence at the airport that will safeguard and grow future employment.

Over recent months there has been a lot of work on identifying new sustainability projects. In April the FAL board approved an investment of £2.1m for a new solar project at the airport, this will generate 1.5Gwh of electricity per annum which will satisfy approximately 30% of the Airport's electricity requirements. The project will go to the RBC Development Committee in the Autumn of this year. FAL is also progressing a new smart LED lighting project for existing hangars and the Meadowgate office building. This will reduce the airport's electricity consumption by 15%. FAL is investing in a voltage optimiser at the Aviator which will reduce the hotel's electricity consumption by 10%.

Finally, on environmental matters, FAL reported that it has sold more SAF (Sustainable Aviation Fuel) YTD than sold all of last year, which is extremely encouraging.

In terms of people and training. FAL has started our CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) apprenticeship programme hiring our first apprentice into the scheme. FAL is in the process of recruiting for its very first Airport Systems Development apprentice who is due to join in October this year. FAL is also undertaking research into additional apprenticeships with the view to introducing more apprenticeship schemes at FAL in 2024.

FAL has reintroduced work experience placements at the airport with a total of 4 this year with the view of increasing that number in 2024. All are from the local colleges with three of them from Farnborough Sixth Form College and the other from Farnborough College of Technology. These work experience placements provide young individuals with an insight into the aviation industry. The aim is to ensure and inform them regarding future potential career paths here at the airport.

As reported last time, FAL hosted the very first Careers Day at Farnborough Airport in January of this year which had a total of 13 companies from across the airport in attendance and over a hundred people attended. FAL is currently planning to have a stand at the Moving On Careers Day on the 5th July this year at Farnborough Sixth Form College to speak to the students about FAL and what it has to offer in terms of future potential career paths.

Simon was delighted to participate in the Community Matters Partnership event earlier this month hosted by Gulfstream where local businesses came together to discuss how collectively FAL can contribute towards raising the aspirations of young people in the local community.

The Aviator Hampshire Hotel continues to perform well, with average occupancy for the month of May at 80%, which compared to the local market of 60%. The Farnborough Airport Company continues to be a Real Living Wage policy having been introduced from 1 Jan 2022.

Finally, the Farnborough Airport Company completed the refinancing of its bank facilities putting in place additional funds for further investment in the airport to secure its market position going forward.

Questions arising:

James Radley -Hart DC – Asked Simon to clarify the power that will be generated from the new Solar Panels to be installed on the new hanger.

Action: Simon Geere to provide clarification of power generated from the new solar Panels to be installed on the new hangar.

George Hesse – Farnham Town Council – Was grateful for the initiatives to support young people mentioned in the report. Young people need more engagement and more local organisations offering opportunities. Could the Airport reach out to more local groups? Cllr Hesse would be happy to help.

Simon Geere – Said FAL would be happy to help.

Jenny Radley - Fleet & Church Crookham Society – Referred back to the planning submission mentioned in the Report and asked if this could be brought to the attention of FACC Members earlier in the process?

Simon Geere – Said he would make enquiries but felt this would be difficult to achieve.

Jenny Radley and Jules Crossley – Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth – Felt it would be useful if Rushmoor Borough Council could inform the FACC once it received any planning application from the Airport.

Rod Cooper - Hampshire County Council – Made the point all applications were available on the RBC website.

Item 5. Farnborough Airport Reports – Gareth Andrews

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

Questions arising:

Jenny Radley – More clarity is required to inform residents; levels of complaints are too high. Could the Airport reach out to the communities worst affected, could the FACC do more?

Gareth Andrews – Responded with a suggestion made at the last meeting; FAL could reply to complaints suggesting the complainant contact their representative on the FACC.

Action: For GDPR reasons, FAL cannot send Members details to residents who make a complaint. Are all Members happy that their contact details are released and how does this initiative become practice?

Item 6. Airspace Change – Rachel Thomas

The presentation given by Rachel can be found on the FACC website.

Questions regarding the PIR:

Jules Crossley – Asked if the Farnborough PIR had met the stated requirements in the CAA Letter dated 15th July 2022?

Rachel Thomas – Responded that FAL had responded to the requirement of the PIR, as regards the specifics of the letter, so the CAA would need to be asked.

David Munro – Waverly Borough Council -Commented that noise from overflying aircraft had increased for some residents in the Waverly area, was this highlighted in the PIR Report?

Rachel Thomas – Where increased levels of aircraft noise were detected, these would be highlighted in the Report and an explanation would be provided.

Questions regarding the FASI-S (Future Airspace Strategy Implementation for South):

Chris Dorn – Hart DC – Could see how the design principle and options are generated, where can you find the criteria against which these are assessed?

Rachel Thomas – Explained how the design principles and options are generated and that options would be assessed against the design principles and against criteria listed in CAP 1616.

Chris Dorn – Asked if the ranking process was objective, quantitative or subjective?

Rachel Thomas – It is combination of all three. This is a huge project, it has not been done before, there is an acceptance that FASI-S will need to be completed in phases and objectivity, or subjectivity and pragmatism would need to be applied.

Chris Dorn – This all sounds complex, ahead of the next stakeholder engagement would it be possible to generate a short leaflet outlining the process in simple steps?

Rachel Thomas – We can try.

After the Meeting Rachel provided the following:

FAL will, as part of our Stage 2 engagement material, provide information on how our options will be evaluated against the Stage 1 Design Principles and assessed against specified criteria in the Initial Options Appraisal (IOA).

An updated CAP 1616 is due to be published this summer, therefore these criteria may change, consequently, FAL would hope to be able to incorporate any new requirements in that engagement material to inform our targeted stakeholders.

The current IOA criteria are available in CAP 1616, Appendix E, which starts on page 194. Table E1 and E2 might be the most help. And the Design Principles Evaluation is explained on page 208. [CAA Airspace Change Doc Mar2021.pdf](#) all these references/specifics may change when the updated document is published.

Based on current timelines FAL plan to engage in September this year.

Jules Crossley – Is it better for the PIR to be concluded before FASI-S? Will a change in government change FASI-S?

Rachel Thomas – Our timeline is likely to allow for assessment of the PIR outcome, which could require amendment of our FASI-S options change in government is unlikely to have an impact other than the possibility it could slow down the process as any new ministers are briefed etc

Geoff Marks - Farnborough Airport Resident Association – Asked if Rachel sees a PBN (performance-based navigation) route as a NPR (Noise Preferential Route)?

Rachel Thomas – No, these are two different criteria not to be confused.

NB – It is Government policy to move to PBN routes. FAL moved to PBN in 2020. Not all airports in FASI-S have done so. FASI-S will be based on PBN. There is a section on the FAL website explaining PBN.

A discussion ensued. - On what premise was the Farnborough ACP based, how was the proposed routing arrived at, could NPR be applied, given the result, could some element of disbursement be applied, is it too late to introduce the principles of 'respite' as a result of the finding on noise will an NPR be triggered through the Section 106?

Rachel Thomas - General response, the FASI-S ACP will be based on the design principles established through public and stakeholder engagement, these are taken through the CAA CAP 1616 process, a final design will be arrived at, implemented, monitored, a PIR will be undertaken and then reviewed.

Any CAA proposed changes from the 2020 ACP PIR may result in further FASI-S options being developed.

Dispersal and respite are not mentioned in the FASI-S design principles.

The Section 106 requirements regarding the Noise Preferential Routings will be addressed at the appropriate point in the CAP 1616 process.

The Chairman – Asked is it too late in the process to alter any of the design principles in the ACP?

Rachel Thomas – Responded, yes, it is.

James Radley – Hart DC – Asked if the process of reducing stacking of aircraft by better management of their flight times could be applied at FAL.

Rachel Thomas – There are processes that are employed to reduce stacking by slowing aircraft down enroute, these are already employed by large airports like Heathrow. As FAL has a different business model and no stacking like Heathrow this is not something FAL are looking at.

It is hoped that FASI-S will among other things, reduce emission of all commercial and business aviation operations. This was mentioned earlier in the presentation.

Jules Crossley – Asked could more be done to educate the public/the residents?

Chris Dorn – Mentioned that the CAA had produced videos that were used to explain these complex proposal charges, could this be done for FASI-S?

Rachel Thomas – Responded that FAL would by necessity have to consult in a coordinated fashion with the other airports involved and would try to produce more, user friendly information.

Rachel Thomas – Mentioned for completeness, FAL is currently working on three other very technical ACP programmes none of which required community engagement or consultation. These are detailed in the presentation slides on the FACC website.

Item 2. Sustainable Aviation -A Talk by Findlay Asher – From Safe Landing

The presentation from Finlay can be found on the FACC website.

The Chairman thanked Finlay for taking the time to present to the FACC.

Item 7. Noise Monitoring Commitments & Proposed Action Plan – Les Freer

The presentation given by Les and Gareth can be found on the FACC website.

Les Freer suggested the FACC establish a Noise Sub Committee (made up of Committee Members only) and bring proposed terms of reference to the next general meeting for approval.

FAL has had three meetings with residents of Churt to discuss aircraft noise, ACP and the PIR.

FAL will deploy the noise monitoring equipment in early July in Churt (which has the highest number of complaints and complainants). Typically, it will be positioned for two / three-month spells and analysis of the data will take a further month.

David Munro – Very pleased with the proposal. Would like to be considered to join the Sub Committee, let's get on with it as soon as possible.

A discussion followed - What will the Sub Committee do, who should be on it, how many members should it have, how will it work, meaningful data and information needs to be the result of any work, metrics need to be agreed, monitored and measured, could the members be from the original members group of the FACC Quiet Flying Programme? Each deployment and subsequent data analysis from the noise monitoring work will cost many thousands of pounds so the information needs to be valued, pertinent and relevant.

Action: FAL will circulate draft terms of reference for the Noise Sub Committee, based on those of other airports.

Action: Members are asked to suggest who should be on the Sub Committee and submit this to the Secretary.

Action: Secretary to arrange meeting to agree make-up of Sub Committee and its terms of reference to be put to the next general meeting for approval. This meeting will probably be held in September.

Item 8. Vexatious Complaints Update – Simon Geere

FAL is grateful to those Members who contributed to the feedback.

There were many excellent points made.

He agreed the original text submitted was not the best way forward.

The submission was immediately withdrawn, there is no immediate plan to re-submit, there is no rush to do so and there will be further consultation with the FACC on this subject in due course.

Item 9. Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public

Geoff Marks asked the following question:

This following statement by Simon Geer features in the UKACC bulletin circulated to members on 2nd June.

“Farnborough is an essential part of the nation’s airport and aviation infrastructure, so it is vital that we help to free up capacity at the major airports and support the growth of UK business aviation and the economy,”

I would be grateful if Simon would address the following question:

Has the government, together with the operators of the designated airports, confirmed that Farnborough must play these roles, and if so, can it be achieved within the current movement ceiling?

Simon Geere- Said -The statement was his own opinion; current government policy is to put to best use the present aviation infra structure. There is nothing in the policy which specifically mentions Farnborough Airport.

Geoff Marks then asked a question on behalf of Hugh Sheppard CPRE Hampshire which was circulated and is attached at Appendix 3.

This was a question to the general Committee:

Members responded – Both methods of measurement are valid and there is merit in both being applied to FAL.

The argument contradicts the already very detailed controls and measurement mechanisms applied through the Section 106.

This is not an issue for this Committee to judge, it is for government to decide and apply the most appropriate measurements and metrics.

James Radley – Noted both Hart and Rushmoor have declared a climate emergency it would be germane to our approach to any future growth plans at Farnborough Airport to question the carbon emissions of business aviation in terms of passenger miles flown.

Jules Crossley – Asked why are so many lights are on in the evening after the Airport has closed? This will cause light-pollution.

Les Freer – Asked where these were and if Jules could possibly send over a photo?

Gareth Saunders – Asked if Colin Shearn could make comment on the DfT commissioned study by Frazer-Nash into the decarbonisation of General Aviation in the UK.

Colin Shearn pointed out that FAL had not responded to the study, it contained a number of erroneous data sets which make it meaningless. The CAA Policy Committee will review the study but it is not something FAL can refer to or use for comparison.

Colin Shearn – Made the assumption that the Farnborough Noise Group will be part of the noise monitoring programme mention earlier in the meeting.

A question from Colin Shearn on behalf of Farnborough Noise Group.

Please see Appendix 4. What are FAL and FACC going to do to improve the engagement with local interest groups?

The Chairman – Responded that the make-up of the FACC was diverse and representative of the community. It has county councillors, town councillors, parish councillors and members representing a number of local interest groups. Only last year, the Committee was expanded to allow Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth to join. The whole purpose of the FACC is consultation and he disputed the allegation the Committee was not representative.

Colin Shearn – Agreed the FACC is representative but it has not engaged.

Jules Crossley – feels there is a lack of technical expertise to support Members and their communities. The Members also need to look at more ways to communicate with Stakeholders.

Geoff Marks – Feels there is a pocket of ‘expertise’ in Churt that could be used by the FACC.

The Chairman – remind the Committee of the recent DfT consultation on Consultative Committees that recommended independent technical support for members. Who would pay?

A discussion followed – Members generally thought that technical advice would be a benefit, it would be seldom required and should be independent.

James Radley – Thought an expert would seldom be required and that if this skill could be found in the community, that could be an alternative.

A motion was suggested to invite the Farnborough Noise Group to the next general meeting and ask it to demonstrate its credentials. This was agreed by the Committee.

Geoff Marks – Said this could bring to an end the friction between the FACC and Mr Shearn.

Action: Members are asked for their comments on having an adviser available to answer and provide guidance of technical questions. How would this be funded and how would it be established to provide independent objective advice. Please submit thoughts to the Secretary.

A personal question was then made by Colin Shearn.

Too many people are being overflowed by general aviation causing noise and nuisance. Does NATS control these flights and can these aircraft be directed to fly over other less congested areas?

Rachel Thomas – These are aircraft flying VFR (visual flight rules). They do communicate with NATS to transit through controlled airspace. The instructions they are given are mandatory and will be based on what the pilot requests and the general situation at the time. The instructions allow for flexibility so that the pilot can manoeuvre to conform to the requirements of flying VFR. The process undertaken around Farnborough is no different to that taken in other areas.

The PIR contains information on GA operations. We await the CAA response to the PIR

Item 10 Matters Raised by the Committee not on the Agenda.

There were none.

Item 11 The next meetings of the Committee will take place on

Thursday 9th November 2023.

At Hart DC, on MS Teams and live streamed on FACC/YouTube.

The Meeting was declared closed.

Approved

Glossary of Abbreviations used in this Document.

ACP	-	Farnborough Airport Airspace Change Proposal.
AIN	-	Aviation International News.
AIN	-	Aviation International News.
ATMS	-	Air Traffic Movements
CSR	-	Corporate Social Responsibility.
FAL	-	Farnborough Airport Limited.
FARA	-	Farnborough Airport Resident Association
FASI-S	-	Future Airspace Strategy Implementation for South England.
FBO	-	Fixed Base Operator.
IOA	-	Initial Options Appraisal.
NPR	-	Noise Preferential Route.
PBN	-	Performance-based Navigation.
PIR	-	Farnborough Airport Airspace Change Proposal, Post Implementation Review.
SAF	-	Sustainable Aviation Fuel.
YTD	-	Year-to-date

Appendix 1.

Actions from Meeting Held on Thursday 9th February 2023. UPDATE June.

Action 1: Action: Members to provide their thoughts on Public access at FACC Meetings.

Completed – Please see attached.

Action 2: For information at this stage, Chris Dorn will establish and provide Hart DC regulations on Public access to the Chamber.

Completed – Please see attached.

Action 3: Jenny Radley to meet Gareth Andrews to discuss whether more detail could be introduced to the Farnborough Airports Reports presented to the FACC.

Completed

Action 4: Les Freer will summarise previous noise commitments and revert with proposed actions plan.

Will be presented at the next Meeting.

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.

Completed – Circulated separately.

Action 6: Members to submit comments and suggestions regarding the position of Vice Chairman to the Secretary.

Completed – Please see attached.

Action 7: Members to submit comments and suggestions on the NEW website.

Completed. New website now live.

Action 8: Action: Richard Ward to respond the Geoff Marks questions.

There has been a healthy rate of correspondence between RW and GM.

Action 1: Action: Members to provide their thoughts on Public Access at FACC Meetings.

From the Secretary

The FACC has always encouraged public access and attendance of Meetings. This was interrupted by COVID but as restrictions have eased so the level of access has increased.

After consultation with Hart DC it has been agreed that the next meeting will be open to physical and online access of Members and the public alike. This should be seen as a trail as both logistics and security are important and need to be managed to the appropriate level.

Here are the thoughts on this subject from Members – Thanks to those who responded.

David Munro

Public access. I feel strongly that the public should have access to FACC meetings, either online or in person. They should be allowed to speak and receive replies according to the constitution. Of course, the Chairman has the right to order them to be silent or leave the meeting in the event of any abusive or unreasonable behaviour.

Jules Crosley

Public access at FACC meetings. I think public should be encouraged to attend and if individuals don't behave appropriately, they should be asked to leave. I think it's unfair for the public in general should be punished for one person, or a small group of people's, behaviour. I also think it's important to encourage public engagement with the FACC and the Airport's operations. Some members of the public wouldn't even know who their 'representative' is - or they may not be happy with how that person represents their views. If an individual, or a group of individuals, disrupt proceedings then they should be banned from future meetings. As we're meeting at Hart at the moment it would seem that this could be managed as the security there is good.

Geoff Marks

Denying access would send an unfortunate message to the public. Happy to hear from Chris Dorn On how HART DC 'control' public access/participation at its members meetings.

The FACC and Farnborough Airport Ltd have always encouraged public access and attendance of Meetings. This was interrupted by COVID but as restrictions have eased so the level of access has increased.

Action 2: For information at this stage, Chris Dorn will establish and provide Hart DC regulations on Public access to the Chamber.

After consultation with Hart DC it has been agreed that the next meeting will be open to physical and online access for Members and the public alike. This should be seen as a trail as both logistics and security are important and need to be managed to the appropriate level.

From Facilities at Hart DC:

Hart DC is prepared to trial a system that allows general public access to the Council Chamber up to a maximum of 25 people. For insurance and health and safety purposes it is important that everyone, including the public, pre-register to attend the meeting. Please send a list of all attendees to the meeting and identify if they are a member of the public or committee member etc, ideally a week before the meeting. Only those who have pre-registered will be allowed to join the meeting.

I will add this to the FACC website and the notice advertisements placed in the local press.

Those members of the public wishing to ask a question and/or attend in person will be allocated admission on a first-come-first-served basis.

Members of the public will be invited to ask questions in accordance with the Constitution.

I am grateful to Chris Dorn and the Facilities Management Team at Hart DC, for their assistance and engagement in this regard, to make this possible.

Action 6: Members to submit comments and suggestions regarding the position of Vice Chairman to the Secretary.

From the Secretary

As mentioned by the Chairman at the last meeting, bringing in a Vice-Chair is to cover the duties of the Chairman if he is not able to attend a meeting for any reason, this has never happened to my knowledge, but more importantly as part of the succession planning process, to allow the successful candidate a period to gain an understanding of the role and issues and thereby to provide continuity as and when the Chairman decides to retire.

It is clear from those comments received; this is seen as a good idea.

We saw potential candidates being suggested by the Members, this has not been the case to date.

Some Members have suggested advertising the role.

Here are the thoughts on this subject from Members – Thanks to those who responded.

David Munro

A VC would be useful and should be selected from amongst existing members of FACC. However, it should not be assumed that the VC should succeed to the Chairmanship - when the Chair becomes vacant, then there should be an open competitive process for selecting the new Chair.

Jules Crosley

I think it's a very good idea to appoint a Vice Chair. As Philip said at our last meeting, he will want to retire at some point and it would be good to have someone who has got to know how the FACC functions.

Geoff Marks

The position should be advertised. Potential fee and expenses being significant to reflect the importance of the role. Meanwhile it might make sense if the Secretary assumed that role.

Action 8: Action: Richard Ward to respond the Geoff Marks questions.

Richard Ward and Geoff Marks are content that they understand each other, importantly they agree that the Local Plan safety policy will continue to require the application of the annual individual risk model and:

1. The S106 agreement requires the airport to undertake a safety audit every year and to report on this within the annual Performance Monitoring Report. The modelling undertaken by ERM on behalf of the airport, in fulfilment of the S106 obligation, is based on the approved DfT methodology documented in NATS Research and Design Report 9636.
2. In the event of a planning application to change the pattern, nature and/or number of business aviation movements at the airport, Policy SP4.4 requires the applicant to submit an independent risk assessment of the implications of the changes for the 1:10,000 and 1:100,000 individual risk contours against the baseline set out in Policy SP4.4 in support of any such proposal.

Appendix 2.

Chief Executive's Office



Rt Hon Jeremy Hunt
House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA

By email: huntj@parliament.uk

15 July 2022

Reference: JE71113

Dear Mr Hunt

Thank you for your email of 5 July regarding new flight paths at Farnborough.

The CAA made a decision to approve a proposal to implement a new airspace design in the vicinity of Farnborough Airport in 2018. The changes to airspace design were implemented in February 2020. Ordinarily, we conduct a post implementation review (PIR) of an airspace change one year after implementation. The PIR will (amongst other issues) consider whether the actual noise exposure of the change is as anticipated when we made the decision.

A PIR considers a year of data. Farnborough Airport's data collection year did not start until April 2022. Data collection for all PIRs was suspended from March 2020 until April 2022 to ensure that data samples are sufficiently representative of normal activity due to the impact of the pandemic on aviation activity. The CAA will start analysis of that year of data in March 2023. The PIR process includes an opportunity for all stakeholders to comment to the CAA on the PIR data collected before we complete our review and publish our conclusions.

We cannot establish where the understanding that the PIR will only consider noise within three miles of the airport has come from and are sorry if the cause of that misunderstanding originated from a statement made by the CAA. In fact, the PIR will consider the noise impact of implementing the new airspace design of all affected aircraft below 7000ft. In terms of distance from the airport, this will include areas much further than three miles from Farnborough. In respect to aircraft landing at Farnborough for example, this extends to over 20 miles from the airport.

Civil Aviation Authority
Head Office: Aviation House, Beehive Ringroad, Crawley, West Sussex, RH6 0YR
London Office: 5th Floor, Westferry House, 11 Westferry Circus, London, E14 4HD
www.caa.co.uk

We will be making sure that our published information on the Farnborough Airport PIR is as clear as possible and will be updating our website to provide additional information and clarification shortly.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'RM', followed by a long horizontal line that ends in a small loop.

Richard Moriarty
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Civil Aviation Authority
Head Office: Aviation House, Beehive Ringroad, Crawley, West Sussex, RH6 0YR
London Office: 5th Floor, Westferry House, 11 Westferry Circus, London, E14 4HD
www.caa.co.uk

Appendix 3.

Question raised By Hugh Sheppard - CPRE Hampshire

and brought to the FACC by Geoff Marks - FARA.

FACC Meeting. 22nd June 2023.

Dear FACC Administrator,

Please kindly accept this preamble and question under Item 10.

'After discussion of a question from me at the last meeting on carbon emissions, the FACC Chairman said 'this would have to be discussed in the future and the FACC would have to keep working on it'. Since then, there has been an email exchange between me and the FAL CEO Simon Geere, copied to the FACC.

With the agreement of FAL, please could this correspondence be made available to all FACC Members - either on request or with the minutes of this meeting - so that the key points of agreement and interest could be more widely known.

In particular, the FACC may wish to note that in his response of 13 June 2023 Mr. Geere said:

'WE DO NOT THINK THE EMISSIONS PER PASSENGER METRIC IS AN APPROPRIATE MEASURE FOR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT. WE ABSOLUTELY BELIEVE IN PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT HOWEVER WE BELIEVE THE EMISSIONS PER FLOWN TONNE IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE MEASURE'

Question:

Given that Dept for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and now Dept for Energy Security and Net Zero publishes annualised data for the contribution in kilogrammes to climate change emissions per passenger per journey kilometre, as a metric already in place for the scheduled commercial aviation sector, does the FACC membership take the view that such a metric should be similarly applied to the private Business Aviation sector of GA? Or do the FACC members agree with FAL that the weight of aircraft is more appropriate, thereby ignoring passenger numbers?'

By copy: in my absence, would Geoff Marks please represent this question on my behalf if necessary.

With all regards

Hugh Sheppard

Hugh Sheppard (CPRE Hampshire)

16 June 2023

Email correspondence mentioned above:

From: Simon Geere
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2023 4:58 PM
To: Hugh Sheppard
Cc: FACC
Subject: RE: EXT: Re: EXT: Re: EXT: FAL and Business Aviation Emissions

Thanks Hugh, all noted. Simon

From: Hugh Sheppard
Sent: 13 June 2023 16:45
To: Simon Geere
Cc: FACC
Subject: EXT: Re: EXT: Re: EXT: FAL and Business Aviation Emissions

Dear Simon,

Finality in such a debate is elusive, but I've sought to clarify my position too. [In Blue].

You may know that while not an FACC Member, I've been attending the public meetings for 12 years and more. However, a personal commitment means I shall miss that of the 22nd.

I'll try to be constructive in putting a question forward nonetheless, so that this exchange might be brought forward into the FACC's public record and incorporated into priorities.

With thanks and all regards

Hugh

On 13/06/2023 08:45, Simon Geere wrote:

Thanks Hugh, for spending the time to respond.

Given you are wishing to share our dialogue, please find below some final points of accuracy for the record.

Simon

From: Hugh Sheppard
Sent: 12 June 2023 21:01
To: Simon Geere
Cc: FACC
Subject: EXT: Re: EXT: FAL and Business Aviation Emissions

Dear Simon,

Thank you for your welcome email of 31st May 2023. It warranted an earlier reply, but rushing it could have appeared trite.

Please put any indication of my general attitude to FAL's parent group as down to experience of the banking arm when in Australia and of its venture into the infrastructure of British broadcasting some 20 years ago.

Taking your points:

On the Home Office consultation, I'm glad that the FACC's understanding that FAL did not intend to reply has been rescinded [WE NEVER SAID WE DID NOT INTEND TO REPLY, SO NOTHING HAS BEEN RESCINDED], * My words related to the FACC 's understanding as in an email* although am at a loss as to why the topic was not felt to be of interest to the membership. It still seems to me that any national record embodying greater transparency as to how many BA (Business Aviation) travellers and to where would help to establish a metric that would encourage individual responsibility on the part of your customers, just as is now readily available to those who contribute to scheduled service emissions. To allege that such transparency could lead to BA being absorbed into scheduled operations is far-fetched and does FAL's notional endorsement of Net Zero no favours. [I HAVE NOT MADE THIS ALLEGATION AND I AM UNCLEAR WHAT YOU ARE SAYING] * Your words were: If it [emissions per passenger] was the answer, then FAB would simply seek to become a commercial passenger airport...*

While you are 'not against some form of emissions per passenger reporting', you are against any 'performance management' [THIS IS NOT WHAT I SAID, I SAID WE DO NOT THINK THE EMISSIONS PER PASSENGER METRIC IS AN APPROPRIATE MEASURE FOR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT. WE ABSOLUTELY BELIEVE IN PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT HOWEVER WE BELIEVE THE EMISSIONS PER FLOWN TONNE IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE MEASURE] * mea culpa, you had said you were 'against it being used for any performance management'.* – which I don't understand – and you then query the objective as being 'merely' about transparency. Yes, of course it is, with nothing mere about establishing parameters for a readily understandable comparison of data. No doubt you are right about scheduled flights where premium passengers fund the capacity for leisure passengers at lower cost [I AM GLAD WE CAN AGREE THIS PRINCIPLE, IT IS AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION WHEN WE TALK ABOUT TRANSPARENCY AND COMPARISONS],* we're on song.* but on the 'polluter pays' principle, wouldn't integrity serve us all better than greenwash? Instead, the industry would like us all to believe that BA travellers fly pen-in-hand to safeguard the nation's GDP while, without the support data, it is unable to deny that they are more likely to be either on a long distance commute or leisure bound. [HAPPY TO DISAGREE ON THIS. THE ECONOMIC BENEFIT OF BA IS VERY WELL-ESTABLISHED. THE INDUSTRY SIMPLY WOULD NOT EXIST IF IT WASN'T FOR THE ECONOMIC NEED FROM BUSINESS, AS SUCH WE ARE A VERY SMALL AND SPECIALISED SUBSET OF THE WIDER BUSINESS TRAVEL MARKET] * Yes, but in the absence of data, other than the BA congestion recorded on Bank Holidays etc. the business/leisure balance inevitably raise its head.*

Maybe with improvements in decarbonisation and more open recognition of the business/leisure divide, the day might dawn when FAL customers are proud of their contribution to funding research into new means of propulsion, instead of relying on privacy to hide from the realities of climate change. The above would be in step with your wish to change industry from within, hastening worthwhile benefits from the development of new technologies.

As to whether SAF is at a dead end, do take that up with Finlay Asher, the speaker booked for the FACC meeting on 22 June. When I heard him late last year, he set out why SAF is essentially an oxymoron given its limited bearing on decarbonising the sector. To my mind, there should be 'no aviation expansion without decarbonisation', for which the tangible ideas you say you would welcome require a more inspired lead from FAL than being one of 255 sponsors for the Freedom Flight Prize, albeit an honourable venture initiated outside the aviation industry. FAL could do better than that, perhaps with a well-publicised venture on the lines I had suggested and some real investment to which your customers could contribute. My guess is they would be more likely to participate if FAL played its part in establishing a benchmark for BA's per passenger emissions, against which to show proven and potential improvements towards Net Zero.

In following the progress of the PIR Consultation I have noted FAL's assessment of Fuel and CO2 emissions data, but see no reason to resile from the 10 times per head and more that business-jet emissions continue to represent. Only this weekend, the ongoing role of SAFs was again raised in the Observer, recalling something about the wood and the trees.

See: <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2023/jun/10/airlines-hope-that-sustainable-fuels-will-propel-them-to-a-guilt-free-future>

Thank you for the consideration shown in this exchange, for which I will seek FACC's circulation to its members in – shall I say – the interest of transparency.

With all regards

Hugh

On 31/05/2023 13:54, Simon Geere wrote:

Dear Hugh,

I understand that you have concerns around emissions and that you feel FAL does not do enough to report or mitigate the issue, however I do take exception to your accusation of corporate camouflage and refute your reference to the Macquarie Group in this regard. On the points you raise however:

1. I can confirm that FAL is providing a response to the Home Office's consultation on 'Advance information requirements for international General Aviation flights'. Just for your information, FAL is already compliant with all Home Office requirements in this regard and the consultation it is really directed at smaller airfields where the data isn't necessary provided or made available in the format the Home Office requires. You seem to believe this will result in your quest for CO2 emissions per passenger per km to be more readily available, I do not think this will be the case. You and I disagree on the best metric for managing emissions performance at FAB, and emissions per passenger is not the answer. If it was, then FAB would simply seek to become a commercial passenger airport, producing significantly more emissions in the process (e.g. from larger aircraft, etc) and generating a much higher level of emissions outside of its direct control (e.g. from exponentially higher volumes of passengers driving in cars to FAB to get on commercial flights). Let's remember, FAB has specific planning constraints imposed upon it which means it can only handle certain types of aircraft for certain purposes. These planning constraints were there to minimise the environment impact of its operation; however, a consequential outcome of these environmental constraints is that we have a comparatively low number of passengers per flight. It now seems at odds to want to advocate a metric which encourages the removal of these constraints.
2. To be completely honest, I am not against some form of emissions per passenger reporting, I am just against it being used for performance management. So I have to ask myself what is the objective? If it is merely an argument around transparency, then let's have an open discussion around the relative impact of business travel on a private jet versus a full-service scheduled airline. Many full-service scheduled flights exist solely to satisfy the demand from the premium-paying business traveller (this is very much the case for flights from/to Heathrow for example), the fact that the majority of these flights are then 'back-filled' with discretionary leisure passengers at marginal cost (as these airlines try to compete with the low-cost airline sector), only distorts the data. I suspect the difference in the 'emissions per business traveller' metric between the two is not as great as is often perceived. The argument then comes down to the 'need' for business travel and I am pretty confident on the economic case for business travel, in particular for FAB's customers. And before you challenge my assumptions, I am not saying all FAB's customers travel purely for business reasons, but what I am saying is that a traditional scheduled airline's profitability and thus its size, scale and emissions footprint, is primarily driven by the demand from its premium fare paying passengers.

3. I don't agree that SAF is at a dead end, as that is a significant stepping stone to the future. Also, there is still a lot of benefit that can be derived from aircraft and engine design. The frustrations I see from activists and campaigners is generally around the speed of change, which I can understand but we also need to recognise that for investment to happen, for change to happen, then we also need an industry that has confidence in its future. It is conveniently naïve to be dismissive of the role of business aviation, to argue for tighter regulation to control activity, and fight the emissions challenge that way. But the winning solution is one where the industry changes from within, where the economic growth and employment benefits of business aviation go hand-in-hand with the development of new aircraft technologies, where business aviation and FAB become 'change agents' for the wider aviation industry. You touched on some of this in your email, which I like.
4. On your concept of Farnborough Foundation for Emission-free Flight, I also like this very much. You may not know but we are aligned with the Freedom Flight Prize, see the attached link. [Freedom Flight Prize](#). Also we are doing a lot of work around the impact of eVTOL here at Farnborough with our partners Vertical Aerospace [Vertical Aerospace \(vertical-aerospace.com\)](https://vertical-aerospace.com). If you have some other tangible ideas then we would love to hear them. I certainly agree that FAB can be a catalyst for change within our sector, that has always been my ambition.

I hope these responses are helpful and perhaps we have narrowed the gap a little on how we see the future. It may surprise you but I value being constructively challenged on what we do here at FAB, and you are right that we are in a prestigious position. We may disagree on the detail and timescales, but we can both agree on the need to embrace future change.

Best wishes, Simon

Simon Geere

Chief Executive - Farnborough Airport

From: Hugh Sheppard

Sent: 30 May 2023 12:22

To: Simon Geere

Cc: FACC

Subject: EXT: FAL and Business Aviation Emissions

Dear Simon Geere,

Re. FAL and Business Aviation emissions.

After the discussion at the FACC meeting of 9th February, government and the media have put more to do with private in-flight emissions into public domain.

Further to the draft meeting Minutes, you may know that while the chairman is reported as '*saying this would have to be discussed in the future and the FACC would have to keep working on it*', he did not agree with my wish to table this as an Action Point arising. As he accepts the FACC should 'keep working on it', I intend to raise the matter again at the meeting on 22nd June.

In the meantime, a new Home Office Consultation on 'Advance information requirements for international General Aviation flights' has begun, on which FAL is no doubt expected to respond. However, as far as I know, the FACC is not informing Members, although the closing date of 16th June is before its next Meeting. While this may not bear directly on emissions, the Minister's Foreword

points out that current passenger Information for GA flights '*does not have to be submitted in a consistent format...*'; i.e.. in the same way as data for journeys on scheduled services, which in turn helps to facilitate published government reports of CO2 emissions per passenger per km.

The DfT also published a report on 18th May 2023 on Decarbonising General Aviation as an outcome of having commissioned a paper of September 2022 on: 'Understanding the Carbon Footprint of General Aviation'. No doubt you are familiar with this too, although as yet responses are not invited.

The point I wish to make is that the corporate camouflage of the Macquarie Group over FAL's contribution to climate change is about to be rendered more transparent on behalf of UK government which, as with international action such as in France, together with media reports as in the Times and elsewhere, is mainly due to environmental interest groups and individuals.

Yet from the prestigious position of operating at the home of UK Aviation, FAL has a heritage to turn to advantage. With aviation expansion set back until emissions are radically reduced and sustainable fuels at a dead end, the future inevitably lies in alternative propulsion technology. Therein lies an opportunity tailored to FAL. For example, tying investment and its name to a *Farnborough Foundation for Emission-free Flight* would help associate its Business Aviation role with that of a benefactor for decarbonising the whole industry.

The exploitation of electric, hydrogen and other alternative sources, initially for small scale, private use, would be better suited to Farnborough's airport, its local authority and the local infrastructure than almost anywhere else.

While I will press on with environmental concerns, I hope that this email will encourage you to recognise that the public interest – and the FACC - could be on FAL's side, if only FAL would go about global pollution in a positive way. This email is sent on my personal account and not at the instigation of CPRE Hampshire or the AEF of which I am a member.

With all regards

Hugh Sheppard

Appendix 4.

Question raised by Colin Shearn.

FACC Meeting. 22nd June 2023.

I draw your attention to the CAA's guidance:

(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/269527/air-navigation-guidance.pdf).

Annex B 9.b states:

- b. where such changes might have a significant effect on the level or distribution of noise and emissions in the vicinity of a civil aerodrome, ensure that the manager of the aerodrome, users of it, any local authority in the neighbourhood of the aerodrome and any other organisation representing the interests of persons in the locality, have been consulted (which might be undertaken through the consultative committee for the aerodrome where one exists);

I would argue that the FACC has not been compliant with this as Farnborough Noise Group has not been consulted and ask how it will be addressed.

Colin Shearn