

**FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON  
9<sup>th</sup> November 2023  
Held Physically at Hart DC and Online with MS Teams  
And streamed Live on FACC/YouTube.**

**Item 1 Attendance, Apologies for Absence and Guests – Please see Appendix 1.**

**Guest Presenter:** Colin Shearn – Farnborough Noise Group.

**Participation: This Meeting**

25 FACC Members.  
22 Members of the Public/Guests.  
14 Viewers followed the live-stream

**Last Meeting**

18 FACC Members.  
4 Members of the Public/Guests.  
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.*

*From a technical perspective the Meeting went 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.*

*This was the best attended FACC Meeting since records began.*

**Introduction**

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

The Chairman welcomed Cllr Jacques Olmo who replaces Cllr Leanne MacIntyre as Surrey Heath Borough Council representative and Cllr David Argent who replaced Cllr Norman Lambert at Crondall Parish Council.

As the Chairman introduced Item 2, below, James Radley – Hart DC, asked to make a statement:

*I wish to put on the record that as a member of the FACC I have not in that role or as a private individual, been party to any injunction to silence any member of the public or campaign group.*

Jules Crossley - Blackwater Valley Friends of Earth, Geoff Marks - FARA, Jenny Radley - Fleet and Church Crookham Society, Gareth Saunders and John Ford - Church Crookham Parish Council wished to make the same statement.

**Item 2. Minutes of Meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2023 – Actions and Matters Arising.**

The Minutes of the meeting had been circulated to members.

Actions from the Meeting please see Appendix 2.

All Actions have been completed, thanks to all contributors.

**Minutes were approved.**

**Matters arising from the minutes:**

There were none on this occasion.

**Matters arising from the actions:**

With regard to Action 1, the Chairman asked that Members continue to give this matter some thought and if they are aware of a potential candidate to please inform the Secretary.

With regard to Action 3, The Chairman asked FAL to confirm legal advice regarding GDPR and passing the details of the public to Members of the FACC. Gareth Andrews of FAL, confirmed he had requested further legal advice following the last meeting and this was the Airport cannot forward contact details/emails from member of the public without their approval.

As part of any response to the public, emails from FAL do suggest making contact with the relevant representative of the FACC. FAL will continue to do this.

Jules Crossley asked if any correspondence having regard to an environmental matter, FAL could mention that she is the Member responsible for environmental issue/matters/questions/complaints.

With regard to Action 7, there was a ranging discussion on the subject of technical experts being brought in to assist/support the FACC and Noise Sub-Committee. When would an advisor be required, when would it be appointed, would there be different advisors for different areas of expertise and who would pay?

David Munro – Waverley Borough Council, asked if FAL would agree to pick up any resultant costs.

Simon Geere – FAL, took an action to look at this and respond.

**Action: Simon Geere agreed took an action to look at FAL meeting the cost for independent advisors and respond.**

***From the FACC Secretary: This is addressed in the Terms of Reference for the Noise Sub-Committee.***

**Item 3. Farnborough Airport Chief Executive Update– Simon Geere.**

Reportable ATMS for September YTD are -5.8% down from 2022 and broadly flat versus 2019. As highlighted previously, the early part of last year benefited from the post-pandemic resurgence in travel due to the restrictions in the prior periods. Further, weekend flight restrictions were imposed from May onwards last year.

Overall market share YTD increased modestly to 31% in 2023 compared to 30% in 2022, however lags the 2019 level of 33%. Generally, FAL expect 2023 to be a more normalised traffic profile when compared to 2022.

Since the last FACC Simon was delighted to announce that FAL was awarded Level 4+ under the Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) Scheme, this is the highest possible standard for carbon neutrality in relation to those emissions within direct control.

This makes FAL one of only 3 airports in the UK to have reached this level of accreditation (the others being Heathrow and London City). FAL remains the only business aviation airport within the UK's top 3 to be recognised as carbon neutral for those emissions they can control.

On other sustainability matters, in October FAL sold its millionth litre of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF). As such, Farnborough Airport has become one of the largest single-site suppliers of SAF to the business aviation community in the UK.

FAL continues to reaffirm its ambition to be a leader in the adoption of SAF within business aviation, and this includes the aspiration to be the first UK airport to become 100% SAF as soon as is practicable.

FAL publicly announced plans to embark on one of the largest innovative light-weight solar installations in the South East. FAL briefed the FACC at the last meeting on this initiative and this will enable the Airport to generate 25% of its own renewable power.

The plans will see solar panels mounted on the curved roofs of our iconic hangars, as well as on the terminal, the control tower, the ground support facility building, and the Aviator Hampshire Hotel.

The installation will also enable the Airport's operational fleet of electric vehicles to be charged using self-generated electricity.

As well as a focus on sustainability, during the period FAL has undertaken a number of community initiatives, including.

- FAL was the headline sponsor at Farnborough community event, Music in the Park.
- FA: was sponsor for the Rushmoor Community in Bloom Awards. Thank to Jules Crossley for making that happen.
- And FAL will be the headline sponsor of the Hampshire Business Awards, which will be held on 30th November at the Farnborough International exhibition centre.

The Corporate Responsibility agenda is important to FAL and has participated in the Global Real Estate Sustainability Benchmark (GRESB) every year to improve performance across its Environmental Social and Governance activities when compared to other similar companies. This year FAL increased its score to 90 out of 100 (from 86 out of 100) which Simon was very pleased with.

In terms of capital projects, construction work on the new hangar development, Domus III, continues and is still scheduled for completion in early 2024. The steel frame and cladding are now complete and the internal fit-out is well-advanced.

Since the last meeting a number of consents have been granted for enhancement works to the airfield facilities which will result in improved operational efficiency which in turn will help partially mitigate ground level aircraft emissions in the future.

Finally, the Aviator Hampshire hotel continues to perform well, with average occupancy for the Aviator during the rolling 12-month period August 2022 – September 2023 at 81%, which compares very favourably to the local market of 68%.

**Questions arising:**

Gareth Saunders – Is FAL likely to hit the weekend flight limits this year?

Simon Geere – The weekend movement restrictions of 8,900, will not be hit this year.

David Munro – Thanks for the update and all the good news. A positive story on the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions on site but for the record the activities of the airport are not carbon neutral.

Simon Geere – FAL can only report on activities directly under its control.

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

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

**Questions arising:**

Geoff Marks – On page two of the Information Report the diagram shows two outlined contours, one red and one blue. Which one applies now?

Gareth Andrews – The Blue Contour.

Jenny Radley – Is it possible to have a location guide for the NO<sub>2</sub> monitors? Why are weekend and heavy aircraft flights increasing?

Schools' tours are great but could this please be widened from Rushmoor BC area?

Mark Sanderson – FAL, explained the school tours would be taken further afield.

**Action: Mark will share a plan for future schools' tour with the Committee.**

Jenny Radley – Commented on a number of details/failings of the Reports as did Chris Dorn. David Munro asked if Complaints by Post Code could be broken down?

Gareth Andrews – Provided an explanation and said he would take another look at the details in the report, correct errors and reissue.

**Action: Gareth Andrews will review and correct the Reports and reissue.**

***From the Secretary: Many of these issues are mentioned at every meeting, I am sure both those making the points and those explaining them would rather not do this. Can I suggest we have another stand-alone meeting solely on reports please?***

**Action: FACC Secretary will ask FAL and Jenny Radley to hold a meeting to resolve issues of clarity and transparency, to the degree possible, of the Reports.**

**Item 5. Public Consultation and Planning Submission Process – Joanne Franko**

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

Jo outlined that the FAL consultation was designed to raise awareness of the application and its contents, encourage a dialogue with all stakeholders, capture feedback and incorporate this in the submission itself. Changes were made and will be seen when the application goes live.

A report containing all the feedback will be published.

The application has been submitted to RBC, is in a validation phase and will be available for all to review next week most likely.

**Questions arising:**

Jules Crossley – Asked if there were changes to the environment grants and would these be available for areas further afield?

Simon Geere – Responded that new funds were to be made available and yes, these would apply to a greater area.

Gareth Saunders – Recounted a story relating to a question he asked. He was neither happy with the responses he received nor the quality of the leaflets and information sent to stakeholders and residents.

Gareth Saunders – Asked Simon to comment on the basis of some of the data used and specifically that relating to an interview he (SG) gave to the Farnham Herald. He did not feel the assumption provided by Simon that aviation growth followed GDP was correct.

Simon Geere – Responded, aviation growth is linked to GDP as well as long term trends which are not reflected in GDP.

Jules Crossley – Commented that the public are struggling with the level of the requested increases in movements given the levels seen today. This is not well articulated in the supporting literature. Is it possible to have a loan of the information boards used at the consultations?

Simon Geere – Replied he would look into it and revert.

**Action: Simon Geere to respond regarding the loan of the Consultation Information Boards.**

Jenny Radley – Offered the A3 size copies of the boards that she had used at a presentation event to residents in Church Crookham.

James Radley – Asked, when will residents be able to review and make comments on the proposals and when will a decision be made by RBC?

Jo Franco – Responded, public consultation will start as soon as the application is placed on the RBC website and a decision will be made in 16 weeks.

**Item 7. Noise Sub-Committee (NSC) Approval and Launch – Gareth Andrews**

The minutes of the inaugural NSC meeting and the proposed Terms of Reference had been circulated the Committee.

Gareth Andrews said the Terms of Reference had been circulated for review and approval and the Committee was asked to select and approve the members of the NSC.

There followed a discussion in which the main topics were - should there be the ability to invite Observers to meetings, the definition of 'replacements' as opposed to alternate/substitute/deputy as used in the FACC Constitution and the make-up of the NSC itself.

**The ToR was approved by the Committee** on the basis that:

There will be no provision for Observers; and

Members of the NSC can appoint replacements so long as they are Members of the FACC.

The initial NCS composed of:

Chairman: Gareth Andrews  
Secretary: Kerry Baldwin

**USERS (2)**

Les Freer – Farnborough Airport Ltd  
Alex Culley – NATS

**LOCAL AUTHORITIES (2)**

David Munro – Waverly Borough Council  
Chris Dorn - Hart District Council

**LOCAL INTERESTS (4)**

Geoff Marks – FARA  
Carl Turner - Ewshot Parish Council  
Jenny Radley - Fleet and Church Crookham Society  
Jules Crossley - Blackwater Valley Friends of Earth

**Action: Kerry Baldwin will amend and update the ToR to reflect the approval.**

**Action: Kerry Baldwin will advise the date for the next meeting.**

**Item 7.      **Airspace Update – Rachel Thomas****

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

**Questions arising:**

Chris Dorn asked the difference between ENGAGEMENT and CONSULTATION.

Rachel explained:

ENGAGEMENT – Is a process held with known/identified stakeholders.

CONSULTATION – Is a process held with the wider public.

James Radley – Is it normal for the CAA to take time to consult with stakeholders in this phase of the process?

Rachel Thomas – Said there is nothing to stop the CAA from doing this.

Geoff Marks – Will this delay and lack of PIR sign-off by the CAA effect decisions on Stage 2 of FASI-S?

Rachel Thomas – Said she hoped the timescale would remain unchanged It is hoped that any recommendations that could arise from the PIR will be incorporated into FASI-S.

Geoff Marks – Asked if Rachel could explain the changes to CAP 1616?

Rachel Thomas – No, as the CAA have only released part of the revised document; that said the, the CAA have rewritten the entire the document but the terms of engagement detailed in Stage1 and Stage2, remain unchanged.

A copy on CAP 1616 can be found through the link in the presentation.

**Item 8.      **Farnborough Noise Group – Colin Shearn.****

A summary of what Mr Shearn said is below, a more detailed piece can be found at Appendix 3.

The concerns of the public regarding the operation of FAL, ACP and PIR are still not being put forward by the FACC. Mr Shearn has produced a video touching on the issues. This can be found at: <https://www.farnboroughnoise.org/fal-expansion>.

The ACP consultation which started in 2014 was not undertaken correctly.

The PIR was not completed correctly; noise and pollution levels were not measured before or after PIR.

PIR is not consistent with FAL operations or ACP proposals.

FAL has not complied with the PIR process.

Frequent complainants are vilified.

The FACC is not performing its prescribed role and does not follow the DfT Guidelines or meet the requirements of the public.

FACC Meetings are too focussed on FAL. There is anger, frustration and mistrust from some members of the public.

Looking forward the FACC must change, more time for public questions, change the voting structure, public issues need to be aired and addressed, a workplan needs to be created and updated meeting to meeting.

The government expects effective consultation from ACCs, rather than protecting the airport from challenge, the FACC should itself be raising and challenging these issues to the airport as stated.

Civil Aviation Act states that the airport should consult with local bodies and organisations representing the interests of residents effected by the airport operation. This clearly describes Farnborough Noise Group and we expect the FACC to ensure that the airport consults with us.

If the FACC does not believe that the Farnborough Noise Group represents the interests of local residents, why not?

The government also expects there should be an appropriate balance of issues discussed at meetings. Allowing 20 minutes at each meeting for questions when there are only three meetings in a year is not sufficient engagement, particularly when much of the information provided by the airport could be circulated to the public in advance and read off-line.

**Questions arising:**

Jules Crossley – Was noise measured during PIR?

Rachel Thomas – The scope of PIR, set out by the CAA, was complied with by FAL.

James Radley – What is the FACC failing to do?

Colin Shearn – This is covered in the recording produced.

Jules Crosley – Supports more time for public questions.

Chairman – Pointed out the Constitution has recently been reviewed and if this is seen to be an issue in the future, it could be considered then.

Colin Shearn – Mentioned, as an example of concerns not being addressed that of helicopters flying at 1000 feet over Aeras of Natural Beauty.

James Radley – Recounted a helicopter story the Committee has heard before.



Colin Shearn – Asked if FNG could have a meeting with FAL?

Simon Geere – FAL has offered to meet and met in the past but nothing positive came from any of those meetings. He would give the matter some thought.

Alex Culley – NATS, said he would be happy to discuss any of the accusations raised by James Radley with the pilot in question.

*From the Secretary:*

*The FACC closely follows the Consultative Committee Guidelines provided by the DfT. If anyone feels we do not please let me know.*

*The DfT do not require public involvement or attendance at committee meetings. Less than 50% of CC's allow the public to attend and less than 50% of these allow questions. In a survey recently completed by UKACC, the FACC was shown to be the most welcoming of committees to public involvement.*

*So to the questions, how should they be handled:*

*A member of the public, members of other stakeholder groups and Members of the Committee can approach the Airport, any Member of the Committee or the Secretary at any time with a question, 365 days a year. The Airport, the Member and/or the Secretary will do their best to respond. If the questioner is not satisfied with the answer, they can approach their local councillor or MP or ask the local FACC Member to either raise the matter in Questions, at the next meeting or if the matter is of sufficient importance, raise the matter for discussion on the agenda of the next meeting.*

*If a questioner is a member of a group not on the FACC or a campaign group, the procedure above applies.*

*Submitting significant numbers of questions ahead of a Meeting is neither permitted under the processes and procedures of the Constitution nor is it a particularly good way to raise a concern and have it command the attention it requires. I would ask all Members to make their stakeholders aware of this and apply the processes and procedures of the Constitution appropriately.*

*Members should be more active in supporting their stakeholders and provide more feedback to the Committee and the Airport. It is not helpful to say 'people are very unhappy about this or that' or 'the public have no trust in the FACC or the Airport' we hear this at every meeting with no suggestion as to how best to respond. Please provide evidence and context so issues can be addressed.*

*Members are already asked what issues they would like included on the Agenda.*

*The current voting system is perfectly appropriate for an organisation which has three separate groups each holding identical voting rights. There are very few decisions taken to a vote; issues are typically resolved through consensus.*

**Item 9      Members Questions and Questions from Members of the Public.**

**Please see questions and answer in Appendix 3**

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

It has not been possible to agree dates for next year's meeting as yet.

**Action: FACC Secretary to circulate proposed meeting dates and venues for 2024.**

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

**Proposed dates to be circulated by the FACC Secretary.**

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

**The Meeting was declared closed.**

## Glossary of Abbreviations used in this Document.

ACA	-	Airport Carbon Accreditation Scheme
ACP	-	Farnborough Airport Airspace Change Proposal.
AIN	-	Aviation International News.
AIN	-	Aviation International News.
ATMS	-	Air Traffic Movements
CAP1616	-	CAP1616: Airspace change: Guidance on the regulatory process for changing the notified airspace design and planned and permanent redistribution of air traffic, and on providing airspace information.
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.
NSC	-	Noise Sub-Committee.
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.

### Attendance List for Meeting on 9th November 2023

**CHAIRMAN:** Mr Philip Riley In Person at Hart DC

**SECRETARY:** Whittacre Hope In Person at Hart DC

#### USERS (10)

<b>Simon Geere</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Les Freer</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Gareth Andrews</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Nicholas Probert</b>	VistaJet Ltd	Apologies Received.
<b>Marwan Khalek</b>	GAMA Aviation Ltd	Online.
<b>Mark Bates</b>	Gulfstream Aerospace Ltd	Online.
<b>Ben Gleeson</b>	Farnborough International Ltd	Online.
<b>Alex Culley</b>	NATS	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Joanne Goodall</b>	TAG Aviation Ltd	Online.
<b>Wally Epton</b>	WJE Associates	In Person at Hart DC

#### LOCAL AUTHORITIES (10)

<b>Cllr James Radley</b>	Hart District Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Cllr. Chris Dorn</b>	Hart District Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Cllr Maurice Sheehan</b>	Rushmoor Borough Council	Apologies Received
<b>Cllr Gareth Williams</b>	Rushmoor Borough Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Cllr Geoff Davis</b>	Guildford Borough Council	Online.
<b>Cllr Rod Cooper</b>	Hampshire County Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Cllr David Lewis</b>	Surrey County Council	Online.
<b>Cllr Jacques Olmo</b>	Surrey Heath Borough Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Cllr David Munro</b>	Waverley Borough Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Cllr Ann-Marie Barker</b>	Woking Borough Council	No Response

#### LOCAL INTERESTS (10)

<b>Cllr Richard Lucas</b>	Ash Parish Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Cllr Gareth Saunders</b>	Church Crookham Parish Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Cllr David Argent</b>	Crandall Parish Council	Apologies Received.
<b>Cllr Carl Turner</b>	Ewshot Parish Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Geoffrey Marks OBE</b>	Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Cllr George Hesse</b>	Farnham Town Council	Apologies Received.
<b>Jenny Radley</b>	Fleet and Church Crookham Society	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Sarah Kingsley</b>	Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut	No Response
<b>Virginia Barret</b>	Farnborough College of Technology	Online.
<b>Jules Crossley</b>	Blackwater Valley Friends of Earth	In Person at Hart DC

### Reserves/Deputies/Alternates:

<b>Cllr John Ford</b>	Church Crookham Parish Council	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Hamish Johnston</b>	Farnborough Airport Residents Assoc	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Colin Gray</b>	Fleet and Church Crookham Society	Apologies Received.
<b>James Granger</b>	NATS	Apologies Received.
<b>Sarah Wood</b>	Blackwater Valley Friends of Earth	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Steven Hunt</b>	Farnborough College of Technology	Online.
<b>Cllr Andrew Laughton</b>	Farnham Town Council	In Person at Hart DC

### Additional Attendees, Guests, Members of the Public and FAL:

<b>Hugh Sheppard</b>	CPRE Hampshire	Online.
<b>Ross McNally</b>	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Apologies Received.
<b>Lisa Hall</b>	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Apologies Received.
<b>Barry Smith</b>	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Apologies Received.
<b>Colin Shearn</b>	Farnborough Noise Group	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Gillian Haskey</b>	Hampshire Resident	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Tom Burton</b>	Farnborough Resident	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Richard Nobbs</b>	Churt Resident	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Huw Radley</b>	Churt Resident	Online. – Will ask Question
<b>Peter Scott</b>		Online
<b>John Eriksson</b>	Rushmoor Resident	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Jay Shearn</b>	Churt Resident	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Norman Lambert</b>	Cron dall Resident	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Clive Teague</b>	GU9 7DA	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Mark Lipyeat</b>	Farnborough Resident	In Person at Hart DC
<b>John Lewin</b>	Woking Resident	Online.
<b>Matt Jago</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Rachel Thomas</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Mark Sanderson</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Peter Russell</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person at Hart DC
<b>Jo Franko</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person at Hart DC

## Appendix 2.

### Actions from this Meeting.

- Action 1: Simon Geere agreed took an action to look at FAL meeting the cost for independent advisors and respond.
- Action 2: Mark Sanderson will share a plan for future schools tour with the Committee
- Action 3: Gareth Andrews will review and correct the Reports and reissue.
- Action 4: FACC Secretary will ask FAL and Jenny Radley to hold a meeting to resolve issues of clarity and transparency, to the degree possible, of the Reports.
- Action 5: Simon Geere to respond regarding the loan of the Consultation Information Boards.
- Action 6: Kerry Baldwin will amend and update the ToR to reflect the approval.
- Action 7: Kerry Baldwin will set the date for the next NSC meeting.
- Action 8: FACC Secretary to circulate proposed meeting dates for 2024
- Action 9: Rachel Thomas to arrange meeting to discuss PBN and NPR with Geoff Marks.

Draft

## Appendix 3.

### Item 9 Members Questions and Questions from Members of the Public.

#### Questions from Members of the Public:

Gareth Saunders - Church Crookham Parish Council – Question below.  
Geoff Marks - Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc – Question below.

#### Questions from Members of the Public:

Hugh Sheppard – CPRE Hampshire - **Online**- Question not submitted.  
John Erikson – Farnborough Noise Group - Question below.  
Tom Burton – Question not submitted.  
Huw Radley – Churt Resident – **Online** - Question not submitted.  
Gilly Haskey – Hampshire Resident - Question not submitted.  
Colin Shearn - Farnborough Noise Group - Question not submitted.

#### Questions from FACC Members:

##### Question from Gareth Saunders - Church Crookham Parish Council

Mr Saunders is attending in person.

The Aviation Policy Framework states that: "*The Government expects all airports and aerodromes to communicate openly and effectively with their local communities about the impact of their operations.*" Despite repeated requests to understand the pollution impact of Farnborough Airport and therefore the impact on human health, there is still insufficient and inappropriate measurement of pollution. This is not compliant with CAA or WHO guidelines. What is FAL going to do to comply with its obligations and when? For the avoidance of doubt, NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and Particulates should be measured. Only NO<sub>2</sub> is measured.

Church Crookham Parish Council would be prepared to work with FAL to identify a suitable site within Church Crookham for the necessary monitoring equipment required for measuring NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and Particulates.

FAL Response:

Simon Geere agreed to look into this and respond.

**Action: FAL to respond to question from Gareth Saunders.**

##### Question from Geoff Marks - Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc

Mr Marks is attending in person.

A request for FAL's further advice regarding PBN and NPR routes. As it stems in part from the draft minutes of the last meeting, I assume it can be taken either as a 'matter arising from the minutes', or later in the agenda as a member's question.

The draft minutes record Rachel Thomas's advice that PBN and NPR routes are based on "two different criteria". Would FAL please explain the different criteria?



In doing so it would be helpful if FAL refer to (a) para 1.6 of the recently revised CAP 1616 as this confirms that NPRs are “agreed by Local Planning Authorities”, and are “not regulated by the CAA or covered by the airspace change process”; and (b), to FAL’s response to the CAA’s FASI-S stage1 feedback report which says any options for NPR changes will be identified at stage 3 of the process, not at the current stage 2.

Lastly, I would be grateful if FAL could also provide examples of controlled airspace within which more than one PBN route is in operation.

FAL Response:

Rachel Thomas said her response was as given at the last meeting.

**Action: Rachel Thomas to arrange meeting to discuss PBN and NPR with Geoff Marks..**

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

#### **Question from High Sheppard – CPRE Hampshire**

I welcome an opportunity to put what will probably be my last question to the FACC on behalf of CPRE Hampshire, from the Policy & Planning Group, of which I shall be standing down in December. On my usual topic of total Farnborough-related emissions, there is no advance notice of my question because I wanted to know that the June Meeting Minutes had first been approved. With that now done, those minutes inform this preamble to my question, for which I’m reading these notes before passing them to the Secretary.

The draft minutes comprehensively covered a question on my behalf put by Geoff Marks together with a detailed exchange of emails between FAL’s CEO Simon Geere and me. Now it is my turn to speak on behalf of Geoff Marks as a fellow member of the Aviation Environment Federation, in that I understand he had asked the FACC to circulate members with an AEF statement about Farnborough emissions, but this was refused – on the grounds that the matter had already been covered. However, the statement was passed to members as an inclusion with a UK Association of Airport Consultative Committee’s circular that FACC forwarded a couple of days later. Why was this important? Because it fulfilled points made in the approved minutes on this matter last time.

My question in June was about FAL’s preference to use a climate change emissions metric based on the weight of the aircraft, as opposed to the more usual metric based on kilogram’s of CO2 emissions per passenger per journey kilometre. The Minutes say on Page 10:

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

The Minutes go on to say:

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

Let’s be clear. The data we are discussing in the AEF report relies on the government supported metric of per capita per kilometre of a journey for various means of travel. It does not rely on the opinion of Hugh Sheppard or Geoff Marks.

The AEF is a non-government organisation that is a member of the Dept. for Transport’s Jet Zero Council, leads ICAO’s Aviation Calculator Support Group and is a Member of the Sustainable Aviation advisory board.

Its report based on Farnborough expansion includes a chart, showing the average emissions of most regular forms of transport on a per person per kilometre basis. The sources of information are the Dept. for Energy Security & Net Zero (DESNZ) and Eurocontrol. THIS IS IT (Holds up chart) From the top this covers Eurostar, coach, the private car and short to long-haul flights, while at the bottom is private business aviation. It isn't even based on Farnborough, but on an average private jet example. My question is in 2 parts:

- Will the FACC, as a 'critical friend' of Farnborough Airport endeavour to establish FAL's acceptance of the FACC member-endorsed criterion of per capita emissions per journey kilometre?

And will:

- FAL recognise that both the emissions per tonne of aircraft weight AND per capita emissions per kilometre are appropriate for its reporting procedures?

And if not, why not?

Thank you.

<https://www.aef.org.uk/2023/10/27/the-climate-cost-of-farnborough-airports-plan-for-more-private-jets/>

FAL Response:

Simon Geere – The emission profile of FAL is a fraction of that of a commercial airport with the same number of movements. It is accepted that business aviation has a different emissions profile to commercial aviation. FAL has environmental conditions applied to it today and these are based on business aviation. It is therefore unrealistic to then seek to apply another metric.

If GOOD means bring in Ryan Air to reduce the passenger CO2 metric, is that something locals want to support?

FAL is honest about this fact, it disclosed the emissions per pax metric in the Consultation.

Hugh Sheppard – Given the metric used is that originally stated by TAG all those years ago, it is reasonable to expect some improvement on those figures. The FACC has recognised the metric is inappropriate so can it please agree to use this moving forward?

Simon Geere – The metrics in the Consultation have been updated.

James Radley – Has sympathy with the question. The Government needs to be harder on changes to society as a whole to ensure the environment is protected for the future.

Should we have a policy in this country to adopt minimum CO2 emissions where possible? It is not for the FACC to challenge FAL when this is not supported by Government policy.

Planning policy follows Government policy.

Everyone concerned should raise this with their local MP.

**Question from John Erikson – Farnborough Noise Group.**

Mr Erikson attended in person.

Mr Erikson - Why was aircraft noise not recorded in the PIR, even though the CEO of the CAA committed to Jeremy Hunt, in writing, that it would be?

FAL Response:

FAL provided all of the analysis requested by the CAA by the deadline date.

This is a question for the CAA to respond to if FNG believe this was agreed in the meeting being referred.

**Question from Tom Burton:**

Mr Burton attended in person.

Mr Burton - Could one of the Macquarie representatives on the airport's board explain why they are asking for any more weekday capacity in this application without any evidence that they need it given that the airport has not been able to materially grow its weekday activity since before 2008 (compound annual growth of 0.84% and ignoring 2020 and 2021 as not statistically relevant due to COVID); has not made use of any of the additional weekday capacity awarded in 2011; and based on this past history is unlikely to need more until 2085?

NB: Macquarie do not attend FACC Meetings.

FAL Response:

Simon Geere – the requested increase in movement is based on a combination of factors, natural growth, displacement from other business aviation airports and national policy.

Mr Burton – Repeated his question.

Simon Geere – Responded, the merits of the application will be judged by RBC.

Mr Burton – Said the overall increase requested was simply to camouflage the required increase in weekend traffic.

**Question from Huw Radley**

Mr Radley attended Online.

Mr Radley – Felt the public were misled by the statistics provided by FAL on Net Zero. What would FAL do to rectify this?

FAL Response:

Simon Geere – The information boards were correct. All the information required was there to see.

There followed a short discussion on SAF. FAL saying this was important to see greater uptake of this across the industry. And Mr Shearn commenting this was largely a waste of time.

### **Observation from Richards Nobbs - Churt**

Richard Nobbs – Information in respect of this meeting was not made available on the FACC website. Please make it so.  
Additionally, what is the FACC doing about Members who do not attend?

*From the Secretary: Apologies if this is the case. I had a look immediately after the meeting and everything that should be there was. Please let me know to what you were referring. Thank you!*

*Attendance is reviewed at the end of the year and those not meeting the requirements of attendance are spoken to.*

### **Question from Gilly Haskey – Hampshire Resident:**

Gilly Haskey – Felt a number of schools were overflowed by FAL aircraft, many of these had young and developing children in them for long periods of time. What monitoring was in place to record noise and emissions?

### **Question from Sarah Wood - Blackwater Valley Friends of Earth**

Sarah Wood - What greenhouse gases are being measured and what monitoring is in place for particulates. She felt the current monitoring was inadequate. Mytchett has felt an increase in aviation noise.

Gareth Andrews – FAL complies with all DEFRA monitoring requirements. FAL is looking to provide more information on air quality.

Jules Crossley – Commented that Friends of Earth was working with Reading University on air quality/particulate measurement and would revert to the FACC with an update.

### **Questions Received which did not meet Due Process and Procedure:**

#### **Questions from Colin Shearn/Farnborough Noise Group.**

Attached are the questions from the public and FNG in advance of the FACC meeting. There will be further questions asked at the meeting. Please also see below information that we request the FACC considers. This follows a meeting a few weeks ago of UK airport groups to which FNG contributed.

There is significant frustration across UK airport campaign groups that the valid concerns of the public regarding aviation noise, pollution and emissions are being ignored. The abolition of ICCAN has made the situation worse as the Department for Transport still hasn't fully delegated all of ICCAN's responsibilities and there still seems a lack of independence when its target is "growth". There was a meeting of UK airport campaign groups on 14<sup>th</sup> October that Farnborough Noise Group attended as the national representative for private jet issues.

The points below were submitted to the Lords Science and Technology Select Committee's "Inquiry into the effects of artificial light and noise on human health" on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2023. The full report is here.

<https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/40937/documents/199438/default/>

#### Health impacts

1. The social, environmental and health problems caused by aircraft noise are well documented and evidenced. We believe that the aviation industry does not fully pay its environmental costs

in terms of noise and emissions. These costs are born by local residents in terms of exposure to noise and the wider population in terms of local and global emissions.

#### The Airspace Modernisation Programme

2. The programme will result in the redesign of the flight paths across London and the South East. This has the potential to introduce new flight paths, imposing aircraft noise on communities that are currently not overflown and exacerbate the noise pollution endured by many others.
3. The programme will also see the greater use of Performance Based Navigation (PBN) which delivers more concentrated flight paths. Policies such as PBN have the potential unintended consequences of creating noise corridors which have been described by the CAA as “noise sewers” leaving resident with little or no respite from the noise.

#### Regulatory Regime

4. There are no effective (i.e. properly monitored and enforceable) mechanisms for ensuring that government policy in general and any noise/environmental benefits asserted to be delivered by airports or airlines are actually delivered.

#### Local Planning Authorities

5. Noise from aircraft is exempt from the nuisance provisions in the Environmental Protection Act 1990 by virtue of section 79 subsection 68. This leaves local authorities powerless to intervene when an ongoing problem with aircraft noise occurs that is not covered by a specific planning condition.
6. If a member of the public feels it necessary to complain about aircraft noise, they have to contact the airport. Communities have limited confidence in the complaints process due to a lack of meaningful exchange in response to their complaint and the fact that the airports are investigating themselves.
7. Aircraft noise planning conditions can be imposed but only in the context of a planning application. Such conditions are usually imposed to mitigate the harm of the development for example, the use of an air traffic movement cap at an airport as has been the case at Heathrow following the Terminal 5 inquiry. Such conditions should be considered at Farnborough because of the associated certainty and control of noise.
8. As stated above, communities often feel they have no meaningful way of challenging ongoing, unreasonable levels of noise from airports and airlines.

#### Government Noise Policy

9. Communities would like to see the core policy strengthened in line with WHO Guidelines to ensure that the total health impacts of aircraft noise are properly understood, analysed and reflected in both government policy and airport approaches to reducing noise. It is worth noting that across the EU, the annoyance reported by residents from a given level of aircraft noise has been shown to be greater than that caused by other transport sources. ([Healthy environment, healthy lives: how the environment influences health and well-being in Europe — European Environment Agency \(europa.eu\)](#)).
10. The evidence shows that there are health impacts at lower levels of noise than current government policy. Consequently, the number of people potentially affected must be known

and appropriate policy measures put in place. It should not be for local community groups to estimate the size of this impact when there are governmental organisations capable of producing the work.

11. There is also a significant issue of trust between communities, government and the aviation industry. This deficit was meant to be addressed by the creation of the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN). However, ICCAN was abolished by the Secretary of State and its functions transferred to the CAA, which is not viewed by local communities as sufficiently independent of either government or industry.

The government has produced policy around aircraft noise. [Overarching aviation noise policy - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk) FNG's experience of having an informed conversation with FAL/FACC about these issues and the legislation has been unsuccessful, which is why communication is now with the DfT and MPs directly. While a "Noise Sub-Committee" is at last being discussed, it would be more effective and have greater credibility if FNG was involved for its independence and knowledge on the subject.

And:

1. Over the past four years, what actions has FAL taken to identify the cause of noise complaints and what actions has it taken to address the cause of these complaints?
2. Over the past four years, what recommendations has the FACC made to FAL to address noise and pollution issues (defined as one of the roles of ACCs in government guidelines)?
3. The Aviation Policy Framework states that: "*The Government expects all airports and aerodromes to communicate openly and effectively with their local communities about the impact of their operations.*" Despite repeated requests to understand the pollution impact of Farnborough Airport and therefore the impact on human health, there is still insufficient and inappropriate measurement of pollution. This is not compliant with CAA or WHO guidelines. What is FAL going to do to comply with its obligations and when? For the avoidance of doubt, NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and Particulates should be measured. Only NO<sub>2</sub> is measured.
4. From FAL's Environment Reports, it is clear that over the last 10 years that the dB Leq 16 hours level has steadily been increasing. Bearing in mind we are at 33,000 movements and an assumed detrimental value of 57dB Leq 16 hours, what assurances can FAL give that noise limits will not be exceeded at 50,000 or 70,000 movements, especially as the onset of negative impact value may reduce to 55dB or 50dB 16 hour Leq?
5. Are there any alternatives to dB 16 hours Leq being proposed to assess the disturbance of noise?
6. Why has "*as an aid to the conduct of their business*" been removed from the S106 and EIA "Business Aviation", yet remains in the RBC Local Plan? How does this impact on the type of aviation at Farnborough in the future?
7. What correspondence did the FACC have with the CAA regarding the delay in starting the PIR?
8. The government's Airport Consultative Committee Guidelines 2014 state: Sect 1. "The Government expects all aerodromes to communicate openly and effectively with their local communities and users of the airport about the impact of their operations". Sect 1.17 states ACCs should "...allow the concerns of interested parties to be raised and taken into account by the aerodrome operators, with a genuine desire on all sides to resolve any issues that may emerge...". This hasn't happened so far, when and how will this happen?

9. Why is Farnborough data excluded from the CAA’s national airport data? This question has been asked to FAL and the CAA many times over the past three years (see issue with DfT report on GA decarbonisation). (<https://www.caa.co.uk/data-and-analysis/uk-aviation-market/airports/uk-airport-data/uk-airport-data-2023/march-2023/>)
10. Why are GA being directed by NATS to fly at low height (sometimes below 1,000ft above the ground) under controlled airspace CTA 4 and through CTA 1? FAL’s report to the CAA states NATS, not pilots, determine the flightpath of aircraft. (Sect 2.1.5 “Sometimes a participating aircraft outside CAS wishes to cross CAS; most of the time this will be rapidly coordinated between the two ATCOs, the aircraft is cleared to enter and becomes subject to mandatory ATC instructions rather than their own decisions”).

**Questions from Gilly Haskey – Hampshire Resident:**

Q1) Farnborough communications in the recent consultations only talk about the carbon emissions from the ground operations; why is there no calculation of in air and fuel use carbon emissions? This needs to be presented and the plan for netting off these carbon emissions described.

Q2) How many individual bookings are there for private flights – Farnborough’s recent consultation information stated there were 95,000 customers a year. Please explain how with only circa 30,000 flights per year of which 40% are empty you get to 95,000 customers per year? Please confirm the individual number of bookings by separate customers. So where you have one customer that books multiple times, this should be counted as one customer.

Q3) The 2022 Farnborough Airport Economic Impact Report prepared on behalf of Rushmoor Borough Council includes the economic benefit of both the Farnborough Airshow and the Aviator Hotel. Why have these non-related businesses been included in the economic impact assessment?

The Farnborough Airshow is run completely independently (and indeed must negatively impact the private aviation operations) and the Aviator Hotel is not in any way linked to the private aviation as the purpose is to fly in and out of the UK and no overnight stays are required near the airport?

Q4) The Civil Aviation Authority **key principles** state that:

To progress an airspace change proposal to the point where a final decision whether to accept the proposed change is made, the change sponsor **must** satisfy the requirements set out in this guidance.

KEY PRINCIPLES SET OUT BY CAA In particular, the change sponsor must demonstrate:	Farnborough’s Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a genuine need for the airspace change</li> </ul>	Current maximum flight numbers are nowhere near being met and there is no evidence that further expansion is required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that relevant options have been devised with the input of those affected</li> </ul>	We received a consultation letter for the expansion but no communication was received for the previous air space change and Churt Council have also issued a formal complaint to say they were not properly consulted on the airspace change which directly effects all the residents.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the impacts of those options have been properly assessed through the quality of the <b>safety, operational, economic and environmental analysis</b></li> </ul>	<p>Increasing flight numbers by such a large number will make the operations much less safe, the economic analysis is flawed as includes for the Aviator Hotel and Farnborough Airshow which are unrelated to private aviation operations.</p> <p>There has been no environmental analysis – the locations of air quality collection are immediately around the airport and the link on the website to these locations and results does not work. No environmental impact assessment has been done in the areas where the flights fly in low over many miles over Site of Special Scientific Interest and AONBs.</p> <p>No noise collection environmental impact has been undertaken other than in the noise budget area immediately around the airport.</p> <p><b>The above are not guidance but required under CAA statutorily enforced rules.</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that a thorough consultation on the chosen option has been carried out and feedback taken into account</li> </ul>	<p>No consultation was undertaken for the impacted residents for the Airspace Change and now the new application ignores the PIR which the impacts of increased aviation numbers will then impact even greater.</p> <p>The airport has not applied with a master plan but broken up their applications to confuse and divide: first increase application in 2014: 13,000 negative responses received. Part A report just said these would be taken in to account.</p> <p>Followed up with Part B report that said the airport’s response was to change the airspace/ flight path and disallowed any comments on increased flight numbers as it was stated that that had been decided.</p> <p>Airspace Change process not followed (see above). No consultation to effected residents.</p> <p>During the PIR review period another increased expansion application was put forward and any comments on the PIR disallowed.</p> <p>No overarching master plan is being considered but the applications are split and don’t allow a proper consultation or response.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the formal submission to the CAA as a fully developed Airspace Change Proposal contains all the information that the CAA and other stakeholders need in the right format.</li> </ul>	<p>As above the proposals seriously fail in following CAA rules.</p>



**If these things do not happen, then the CAA will not allow a gateway in the process to be passed.**

Q5) My asset (house and business) will be hugely negatively affected – whilst Macquarie are increasing the value of their asset. **Under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 (LCA 1973), qualifying owners and occupiers of residential (and some agricultural and smaller commercial) interests in land, are entitled to claim compensation where certain new infrastructure works, or alterations to existing airport infrastructure, are brought into use**, including the extension of existing runways or the addition of new taxiways or aprons. Compensation is payable where the use of the relevant airport works (including anticipated intensification of use in the future), causes an increase in one or more “physical factors”, including noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke and artificial lighting, and discharges on to land, that results in a depreciation in the value of the claim property.

Draft