



FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE – Noise Subgroup Committee

**Meeting: Wednesday 11th October 2023 at 14:00-16:00 hrs
at
Farnborough Airport – for Members**

Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES:

Gareth Andrews – Chairman
Kerry Baldwin – Secretary

AIRPORT USERS

Les Freer – FAL Representative
Rachel Thomas – FAL Representative/ Technical Expert

LOCAL AUTHORITIES

David Munro - Waverley Borough Council
Chris Dorn - Hart District Council (Teams)

LOCAL INTERESTS

Cllr Carl Turner - Ewshot Parish Council
Geoff Marks - FARA
Jenny Radley - Fleet & Church Crookham Society

APOLOGIES

Jules Crossley - Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth

Item 1. Introductions and Apologies;

Introductions were made.

The background to the establishment and size of this group was discussed, it was originally mentioned in the FACC meeting in June 2023 that FAL saw the membership being one representative from each group and a deputy.

LF – Philip and Whitt did wish to attend the meeting, but we stood them down as we believe they should be impartial whilst chairing the FACC. However, if attendees of the subgroup wish for them to attend then we are open to this, and it may be appropriate for them to be at some of the future meetings.

GA – In June, it was said that we would look into creating a subgroup for noise which was well received by FACC members. The meeting today is to understand and determine the ToRs for a successful subgroup.

LF - We listened and took on the feedback from the FACC members for the subgroup and can see the need for this group to be in place. Flexibility is integral, and the content will be changing.

After input from the FACC members it was apparent that two members from each group should be allowed, therefore it was confirmed that there will be 6 members (two from each FACC group) in total excluding the chairman and secretary.

Item 2. ToR – approval

The group proceeded to review the ToR line by line. The major discussion themes are captured in these minutes. The updated ToR are attached along with these minutes.

A suggestion was made that the wording within the ToRs should stimulate two-way communication between communities and the subgroup. However, all agreed that everything done needs to go through the FACC in the correct channel. Wording to stay the same.

The need to be compliant with s106 regulations and government policies should be in the TOR. It is agreed that if there are any change in procedures then FAL will highlight this to the NSC.

Discussion took place around complaints as it is harder for FACC members to follow up with individuals who complain due to the GDPR issue around only being able to provide part of postcodes. Cllr CT– Suggested the addition of a clause in the complaint process that complaints could click to say, “happy to share contact details with FACC”.

Action 1: GA to investigate the GDPR issue and engage with Envirosuite on what is required to update the complaints process (i.e., tick box accepting details will be passed onto FACC representatives).

LF expressed concern over the fact that only a small number of the FACC membership actively participate in the committee. Only a third actively engage, so how do we encourage the others to do so?

Action 2: LF to raise in next FACC Meeting

The group recognise the need of participation from the wider FACC membership.

Discussion took place regarding whether to include Airspace Change within the topics of the NSC and ultimately decided to leave this within the topics for now, but only to be discussed if it has direct relevance to noise.

Discussion around membership took place, the size of the subgroup-committee and the need to be flexible.

It was agreed that Reserves/Substitutes will be allowed in the event of absence of subgroup-committee members and that these meetings would not be open to the public. To help with attendance there should always be the option of a Teams link.

All agreed that the meetings should last the duration of two hours.

The TOR, with the changes agreed in this meeting were approved. All subgroup members were mindful of the fact that the TOR membership may need to be reviewed and altered as the group proceeds with this work to ensure the agreed outputs.

Item 3. Agree the strategy (locations, frequency, reports)

Discussion of deployment of the noise monitor took place –

GA - Main reason for deployment will be to understand noise in a specific area (which could be identified through noise complaint data), for instance how many flights, lowest flight of

that detailed location etc. Secondly, the information could help inform the noise insulation scheme. Through discussion it was recognised that deployment to sites requires meeting certain specifications, but that requests or recommendations would be welcomed through members. As the number of community noise reports increase trends should be identifiable which this group could then discuss/understand.

JR - hoped that noise sensitive sites such as schools and hospitals could be considered as possible location sites.

It is yet to be decided how the data from the noise monitors will be displayed in the reports. There are lots of ways this could be done. GA showcased the noise reports from London Luton and London City as examples, caveated some of the things we can do internally such as heat maps, runway usage, average number of movements per day/per hour/per time, aircraft tracks, gate analysis (i.e. altitude), percentage of different operations at different altitudes, aircraft type etc..

It was explained that the noise data being collected from the deployed noise monitor in Churt goes directly to Bickerdike Allen Partners, and FAL does not see this. GA explained that the noise consultants usually take about 4 weeks to deliver a report once the monitoring period has been completed. He does not have a date for the completion of the Churt report yet.

Action 3: GA to confirm the possibilities of Bickerdike Allen Partners on the reporting preferences as decided by the committee.

Discussion took place as to where is best to locate the noise monitor, once it is available (when Churt is complete) and for how long it should be deployed. If we are trying to gather information for both Easterly and Westerly operations, then they need to be deployed for approximately 3 months at each location to cover all variables in weather and to be aware that if the time is less than this then it may not provide the full picture in the analysis.

During the discussions GA mentioned that there are permanent monitors out at Tweseldown and Farnborough College. The members decided that a good place for deployment will be Crookham Park, and the temporary monitor will be deployed there for a period of three months.

Action 4 JR to provide to GA the contact details for Claire Inglis (Parish Clerk) who is likely to have details of schools in Crookham Park that may facilitate placement of the monitor. – *Action complete*

Item 4. Current noise Complaint trends YTD and communication

The meeting concluded before Item 4 was reached in detail, and so this will go forward into the next NSC meeting.

Close of meeting

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 23rd January 2023, 14:00-16:00hrs.