

FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON  
27<sup>th</sup> June 2024  
Held on MS Teams  
And streamed Live on FACC/YouTube.

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

<b>Participation:</b>	<b>This Meeting</b>	<b>Last Meeting</b>	<b>Best</b>
	18 FACC Members.	25 FACC Members.	25
	0 Members of the Public/Guests.	5 Members of the Public/Guests.	22
	24 Viewers followed the live-stream	11 Viewers followed the live-stream.	24

*This meeting was recorded and a link to this is available on the FACC Website.*

*Thanks to FAL IT for all their support.*

**Item 2. Minutes of Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2024 – Actions and Matters Arising.**

The Minutes of the meeting had been circulated to Members.

For actions from the Meeting - please see Appendix 2.

All actions were completed, thanks to all contributors. Action 7 led to a follow up action.

**The Minutes were approved.**

**Matters arising from the Minutes:**

There were none.

**Matters arising from Actions:**

With regard to Action 7, Geoff Marks submitted a follow-on question, please see Appendix 3.

**Action: FAL, BAP to respond to Geoff Marks question, see Appendix 3.**

**Item 8. Chairmans Remarks & Update on new Chairperson.**

The Chairman welcomed new Members to the Committee, Cllr Keith Dibble - RBC, Cllr Craig Card - RBC, Cllr Gareth Ives – Crondall PC and John Whately – Dassault Aviation Ltd.

The Chairman informed the Committee that following due process, a new chairman, to replace him from the next meeting onwards, had been selected by the FACC Selection Panel and FAL. The new chairman is Colin Flack, OBE.

Colin has extensive experience working with consultative committees and well qualified for the position, he is the current chair of the Consultative Committee at Birmingham International Airport and is the Chair of UKACC. The Chairman wished Colin all the best in his new role.

*Note from the Secretary – Colin Flack will be introduced to the Committee ahead of the next meeting in November. What form this forum will take, is unknown.*

**Item 8. Farnborough Airport Community Environmental Fund Update – Sophie Rogers - Climate Change Officer - RBC**

Sophie gave an excellent presentation talking to the slides to be found on the website in Meeting Information.

**Questions arising: -**

**Geoff Marks** – Asked why were applications limited to a radius of 5km?

**Sophie Rogers** – Responded, the fund is designed to support issues of the environment and nature in the immediate vicinity of the airport, the area of coverage reflects this.

**Jules Crossley** – There has been an enquiry on the wording of the criteria in order to offer more clarity for those wishing to apply. The possibility of the change in wording is currently being reviewed.

**James Radley** – There appears to be a low number of successful applications in the Hart area. He asked how would he find more details relating to grant applications from the Hart DC area?

**Sophie Rogers** – Responded that this information is shared with her counterpart in Hart DC.

**Chris Dorn** – Agreed with Cllr Radley and asked about the level of application.

**Sophie Rogers** – To date in 2024, 7 grants have been awarded and 3 declined. Those declined did not meet the criteria, specifically they did not demonstrate an improvement to the local environment. RBC is promoting the scheme and there is a steady stream of new applications.

**Jules Crossley** – Remarked, the Portfolio Holder for Community & Residents is Sophie Porter, please email her with any thoughts or suggestions relating to the Community Environmental Fund, especially now as it there is a consultation in progress.

**The Chairman** - Thanked Sophie on behalf of the Committee.

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

**Simon Geere** – Thanked Sophie for her presentation. He added that the levies to the Fund would be quadrupled if the current planning application were to be successful.

In terms of traffic, the FAL total reportable ATMs for May YTD were slightly lower than the same period last year at -3.2%.

For the non-weekdays, reportable ATMs were -4.6%. However, in the aircraft category between 50-80 tonnes ATMs were significantly higher with a 50% increase total and a 55% increase on a non-weekday basis.

This is primarily driven by the introduction of the latest Global 7500 aircraft to the VistaJet fleet, as reported to the Committee in March.

The FAL market share remains stable year-on-year at 31%; the weekend mix is slightly lower against last year at 28% versus 29% for the 5 months to May.

FAL is continuing to invest in facilities. Domus III, the new hangar is now fully operational, and earlier this month the airport completed the installation of a new £3m security upgrade which adopts the latest government mandated technology, whereby passengers no longer need to remove liquids and laptops from their hand baggage.

The installation work is ongoing on the solar project which is one of the largest innovative light-weight solar installations in the Southeast. The solar panels are now mounted on the curved roofs of the hangar and work is commencing on the terminal building. The Airport will generate 25% of its power from this renewable source.

Further to a request from the Committee to notify Members if any planning applications had been submitted since the last meeting, Simon confirmed no new planning applications have been submitted.

In April FAL won two more awards: Europe's No 1 FBO in Europe in the Professional Pilot PRAISE survey 2024. And

The Aviator Hampshire Hotel was named one of the top two leading hotels in the UK by TripAdvisor's Travellers Choice Best of the Best Hotel Awards.

FAL has also been recognised again as one of the UK's top 100 Great Places to Work.

These awards follow on from those successes already reported to the Committee, namely, No 1 business aviation airport in the AIN awards for the 17<sup>th</sup> year in a row and best FBO at the Air Charter Association Excellence awards for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year in a row.

In terms of community engagement FAL undertook the following activities:

It was the headline sponsor of the Aldershot-hosted match between England C and Nepal.

Various school tours were undertaken (as detailed in section 6 of the Farnborough Airport information report).

As part of Know Your Airport community engagement sessions, FAL welcomed five community groups to our Nexus Hub for a presentation and tour of the airport.

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

**Questions arising:** - None on this occasion.

#### **Item 5 Farnborough Airport Reports – Gareth Andrews**

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

**Questions arising:** - None on this occasion.

**Chris Dorn** – Remarked that out of hours and low flying military aircraft movements are posted on the RAF Odiham website.

**Jenny Radley** – Noted there were complaints from GU51 and GU52, she would like to follow-up with Gareth with regard to these.

With regard to the proposed Complaints Report, which had been circulated to Members, Gareth asked for comments.

**Chris Dorn** – Could the report show what percentage of noise was caused by aircraft types?

**Jenny Radley** – Asked if the reports supplied to RBC should include the same details as those provided to the FACC? Details such as aircraft type and runway used.

**Gareth Andrews** – Responded, he would ask RBC.

**David Munro** – Mentioned he was part of the NSC who proposed this new form or report; on reflection he felt having the details of every flight was useful.

**James Radley** – Liked the new form report but also felt the current one was useful, could we have both?

**Chris Dorn** – Suggested the reports could be published in Excel rather than PDF format and that would allow Members to extract the information themselves.

**Andrew Laughton** – Remarked he was a councillor in GU10, he was shocked to see the level of complaints emanating from his ward, why was this?

**Gareth Andrews** – Invited Andrew to visit the Airport to better understand the issues.

**Andrew Laughton** – Accepted.

*Note from the Secretary – The primary responsibility of Members is to understand the issues in their respective areas from the perspective of their residents, complainants, the Airport and any other stakeholder such as NATS, air operators, the CAA or the DfT. In some cases, there will be a solution to issues of concern, unfortunately in some there will not.*

**Gareth Andrews** – Agreed to take all the comments back to the NSC for further discussion.

**Item 6. Acoustic Services an Overview - Bickerdike Allen Partners**

David Charles gave a presentation talking to the slides to be found on the website in Meeting Information.

**Questions arising: -**

**James Radley** – Prefaced his comments by saying he often says this.... He does not feel the LAeq method of recording sound over a period of time is appropriate for FAL as the frequency of movements is not regular enough to establish a baseline.

**David Charles** – Did not agree. The LAeq was absolutely the correct measurement of noise measurement for FAL.

*Note from the Secretary - On frequency of movements, this was specifically addressed in the now withdrawn PPG24 which included 'For small aerodromes local planning authorities should not rely solely on Leq where this is based on less than about 30 movements a day.' Aside from whether Farnborough is considered small, current movements are around 80 per day and are expected to increase.*

**Geoff Marks** – Submitted questions, these and responses can be found at Appendix 4.

**Richard Lucas** – What can airports do to reduce their noise output?

**Charles Davis** – Ground noise can be managed by utilising barriers, such as earth works, buildings or dedicated fencing. Operational/air noise can be managed through aircraft flight operations or by airspace change which FAL has recently implemented.

*Note from the Secretary – Farnborough Airport has recently implemented an airspace change. The fundamental premise of ACP is that aircraft routings are concentrated over less densely populated areas so more aircraft fly over fewer people and areas with greater density of population experience less aircraft disturbance. Many areas around Farnborough have benefited greatly from the ACP. The CAA is still assessing, through the PIR, if the ACP delivered what it was designed to do.*

**The Chairman** - Thanked David on behalf of the Committee.

**Item 7. Noise Sub-Committee Report – Gareth Andrews.**

Gareth Andrews gave a presentation talking to the slides to be found on the website in Meeting Information relating to the activities of the NSC and presented a summary of the Churt Noise Report.

**Questions arising: -**

**Richard Lucas** – Asked what can be done to remove the 5% most noisy aircraft? And what course or action is being taken to effect change?

There were a number of similar questions and statements from Members.

**Simon Geere** – There are a number of ways in which the impact of noisier aircraft could be minimised, operating procedures or financial levies for example, this has to be an iterative process based on facts and working within the government guidelines.

*Note from the Secretary – The aircraft that operate from Farnborough Airport meet the highest standards of noise suppression and engine emissions. The Churt Noise Report shows that as a result of ACP, Churt experiences a concentration of flights in its airspace. The Report shows that despite this, the levels of noise experienced are below/within government guidelines. This does not mean residents are not annoyed or angered by aircraft noise. Whether the ACP meets its design parameters still needs to be agreed by the CAA through the PIR.*

**David Munro** – Asked if the editorial changes requested had been made to the Churt Report and if it could be generally circulated.

There was a discussion. It was agreed the Churt Report would not be generally circulated until the requested changes had been made. Gareth would chase.

**Action: Gareth Andrews to chase editorial changes to Churt Report.**

**Action: Final version of the Churt Report will be issued to Members as soon as ready.**

**Item 9 Public Consultation and Planning Submission Process – Joanne Franco**

Joanne gave a presentation talking to the slides to be found on the website in Meeting Information.

FAL continue to work through the Regulation 25 request for clarity or additional information from Rushmoor Borough Council and from consultee feedback (both public and statutory consultees). FAL aim to conclude the response to the Reg 25 in July; once completed, more detail around scheduling will be known.

**Questions arising:** - None on this occasion.

**Item 10 Airspace Update and Airshow Details – Les Freer & Rachel Thomas.**

Les and Rachel each gave a presentation talking to the slides to be found on the website in Meeting Information.

**Questions arising:** - None on this occasion.

**Item 11 Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public**

Questions from FACC Members: - Geoff Marks – See Appendix 4

Questions from Members of the Public: - None on this occasion.

**Item 12** *Matters raised by the Committee not on the Agenda.*

Many Members including James Radley, Rod Cooper, Chris Dorn and Simon Geere thanked the Chairman for his commitment and dedication to the FACC and the role as Chairman.

Simon Geere said in recognition of his achievements and service to the role, FAL would host a reception in honour of the Chairman at the Aviator Hotel for the Members before Christmas and hope everyone would attend.

Simon expressed the gratitude of FAL management past and present, for great contribution Philip had made to the FACC over the years.

**Item 13** **The next meeting of the Committee will take place on:**

**Thursday 21st November 2024.**

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

**The Meeting was declared closed.**

## Glossary of Abbreviations used by the FACC.

ACA	Airport Carbon Accreditation Scheme
ACP	Farnborough Airport Airspace Change Proposal
AIN	Aviation International News.
ANSP	Air Navigation Service Providers
ATMs	Air Traffic Movements
BAP	Bickerdike Allen Partners
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.
EPND	Effective Perceived Noise in Decibels.
FAL	Farnborough Airport Limited.
FARA	Farnborough Airport Resident Association
FASI-S	Future Airspace Strategy Implementation for South England.
FBO	Fixed Base Operator
FNG	Farnborough Noise Group
GA	General Aviation
IOA	Initial Options Appraisal
INM Reports	Integrated Noise Model Reports
LA90	The level exceeded for 90% of the time is normally used to describe background noise.
LAeq, T	The most widely applicable unit is the equivalent continuous A weighted sound pressure level (LAeq, T). It is an energy average and is defined as the level of a notional sound which (over a defined period of time, T) would deliver the same A-weighted sound energy as the actual fluctuating sound.
LASmax	The maximum level with A-weighted frequency response and Slow time constant.
LAm <sub>ax</sub> ,T	The maximum A-weighted sound pressure level, normally associated with a time weighting, F (fast), or S (slow).
LARS	Lower Airspace Radar
N65	The number of aircraft noise events with a maximum noise level of 65 dB LASmax or greater at a specific location and in a defined time period. Typically, contours ranging from 10 events to 500 events are plotted.
NERL	NATS En-Route PLC .
NSC	Noise Sub-Committee
NPR	Noise Preferential Route.
PBN	Performance-based Navigation
PIR	FAL Airspace Change Proposal, Post Implementation Review.



RBC	Rushmoor Borough Council
SAF	Sustainable Aviation Fuel.
SEL	The Sound Exposure Level (SEL) is the constant sound level that has the same amount of sound energy in one second as the total sound energy of an event over its entire duration. This is equal to $L_{Aeq,T} + 10 \log(T)$ , where T is the duration in seconds.
SID	Standard Instrument Departure
STAR	Standard Instrument Terminal Arrival Procedure
UKACC	The UK Association of Consultative Committees
VFR	Visual Flight Rules
YTD	Year-to-date

## Appendix 1.

### Attendance List for Meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2024

#### Attending:

<b>CHAIRMAN:</b>	Mr Philip Riley	In Person Online.
<b>SECRETARY:</b>	Whittacre Hope	In Person Online.
<b>USERS (10)</b>		
<b>Simon Geere</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person Online.
<b>Les Freer</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person Online.
<b>Gareth Andrews</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person Online.
<b>John Whately</b>	Dassault Aviation Group Ltd	In Person Online.
<b>Marwan Khalek</b>	GAMA Aviation Ltd	In Person Online.
<b>Mark Bates</b>	Gulfstream Aerospace Ltd	Apologies Received.
<b>Ben Gleeson</b>	Farnborough International Ltd	Apologies Received.
<b>Alex Culley</b>	NATS	In Person Online.
<b>Joanne Goodall</b>	TAG Aviation Ltd	Apologies Received.
<b>Wally Epton</b>	WJE Associates	Apologies Received.
<b>LOCAL AUTHORITIES (10)</b>		
<b>Cllr James Radley</b>	Hart District Council	In Person Online.
<b>Cllr. Chris Dorn</b>	Hart District Council	In Person Online.
<b>Cllr Keith Dibble</b>	Rushmoor Borough Council	Apologies Received.
<b>Cllr Craig Card</b>	Rushmoor Borough Council	
<b>Cllr Geoff Davis</b>	Guildford Borough Council	
<b>Cllr Rod Cooper</b>	Hampshire County Council	In Person Online.
<b>Cllr David Lewis</b>	Surrey County Council	In Person Online
<b>Cllr Jacques Olmo</b>	Surrey Heath Borough Council	Apologies Received.
<b>Cllr David Munro</b>	Waverley Borough Council	In Person Online
<b>Cllr Ann-Marie Barker</b>	Woking Borough Council	Apologies Received - Alternate
<b>LOCAL INTERESTS (10)</b>		
<b>Cllr Richard Lucas</b>	Ash Parish Council	In Person Online.
<b>Cllr Gareth Saunders</b>	Church Crookham Parish Council	Apologies Received.
<b>Cllr Gareth Ives</b>	Crandall Parish Council	In Person Online.
<b>Cllr Carl Turner</b>	Ewshot Parish Council	In Person Online
<b>Geoffrey Marks OBE</b>	Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc	In Person Online
<b>Cllr George Hesse</b>	Farnham Town Council	Apologies Received - Alternate
<b>Jenny Radley</b>	Fleet and Church Crookham Society	In Person Online
<b>Cllr David Whitcroft</b>	Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut	Apologies Received.
<b>Virginia Barret</b>	Farnborough College of Technology	In Person Online.
<b>Jules Crossley</b>	Blackwater Valley Friends of Earth	In Person Online.

### Reserves/Deputies/Alternates:

<b>Hamish Johnston</b>	Farnborough Airport Residents Assoc	In Person Online
<b>Cllr Andrew Laughton</b>	Farnham Town Council	In Person Online – For G Hesse
<b>Sarah Wood</b>	Blackwater Valley Friends of Earth	In Person Online
<b>Steven Hunt</b>	Farnborough College of Technology	
<b>Tom Wilson</b>	TAG Aviation Ltd	
<b>Cllr John Pearce</b>	Woking Borough Council	In Person Online – For A L Baker.

### Additional Guests:

<b>Sophie Rogers</b>	Rushmoor Borough Council	Presenting
<b>David Charles</b>	Bickerdike Allen Partners	Presenting
<b>Richard Ward</b>	Rushmoor Borough Council	
<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>Alpa Shingadia</b>	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Apologies Received
<b>Matt Jago</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	Apologies Received
<b>Rachel Thomas</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person Online
<b>Kerry Baldwin</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person Online
<b>Peter Russell</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	Apologies Received
<b>Mark Sanderson</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person Online
<b>Darren Blair</b>	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person Online
<b>Colin Flack</b>	FACC	In Person Online

### Members of the Public:

Members of the public could view a live stream of the meeting on YouTube.

There were no questions from members of the public, so there were no requests to attend online.

### Changes to the Committee

#### Users

**John Whately** of Dassault Aviation Group Ltd replaces **Nicholas Probert** of VistaJet Ltd

#### Local Authorities

**Cllr Keith Dibble** of Rushmoor Borough Council replaces Maurice Sheehan.

**Cllr Craig Card** of Rushmoor Borough Council replaces Gareth Williams.

#### Local Interests

**Cllr Gareth Ives** joins as representative for Crondall Parish Council

## Appendix 2.

### Actions from Meeting Held on 21st March 2024 – June 2024

Action 1: Jenny Radley and Gareth Andrews to revisit details of complaints.

The FAL legal team has confirmed the Airport is not allowed, under GDPR, to release the personal details of complainants without their approval. This matter was discussed at the Noise Sub Committee, there will be no further action. **Completed.**

Action 2: Jenny Radley and Mark Sanderson to talk about potential junior or primary schools that would benefit from an airport visit.

FAL has been in contact with Fleet and Church Crookham primary schools about making presentations to pupils. In June, Mark gave two assembly presentations to Church Crookham Junior School, who demonstrated how very knowledgeable and enthusiastic they were about the Airport. **Completed, ongoing, work in progress.**

Action 3: Succession Plan of Action will be circulated to Members.

**Circulated to Members 12<sup>th</sup> April 2024. – Completed.**

Action 4: Members are invited to nominate other Members or stand themselves for the selection Committee. **Completed.**

Action 5: Members are invited to put forward nominees to enter the selection process.

**Submission date passed. Completed.**

Action 6: Gareth Andrews to circulate WebTrak details. **Completed.**

Action 7: Geoff Marks to provide Inspectors Report.

Please see attached. **Completed.** This has led to a follow up action.

Action 8: Gareth Andrews to circulate Churt Village Noise Report when available.

The Churt Noise Report was reviewed by the Noise Sub Committee and brought to this meeting. Gareth Andrews talked to a presentation, attached.  
The NSC had requested a number of small changes be made prior to general circulation; these will be completed as quickly as possible. At that time, the report will be circulated to Members.

**Action 1: Jenny Radley and Gareth Andrews to revisit details of complaints.**

-----Original Message-----

From: Gareth Andrews

Sent: Friday, April 19, 2024 2:55 PM

To: Jenny Radley

Cc: Philip Riley

Subject: RE: EXT: RE: Meeting Information on the FACC web-site

Good afternoon, Jenny,

Please find my response below after consultation with our data protection officer (DPO).

We understand that you would like us to share with you the street names in which the complainants reside in order that you may reach out to individuals in that area with a view to investigating the complaints in greater depth. However, having carefully considered this request and having consulted our Data Protection Officer ("DPO"), we have decided against this because of the data protection implications explained below.

We appreciate that you have not asked us to share the names or exact addresses of the complainants with you. However, by sharing the street names in which they live, it may, potentially, be possible to identify the complainants indirectly and, in such circumstances, the information shared will amount to personal data. We, therefore, need to ensure that we comply with the data protection legislation.

The present position is that the complainants provide us with details of their complaint. When submitting their complaint, complainants are provided with our privacy notice but this does not state that their personal data will be shared with the FACC and we do not collect consent to pass their street address to you. Therefore, if we were to provide you with this information, we would be doing so without the complainants' knowledge or consent and we would not be complying with the data protection principle to process personal data fairly, lawfully and in a transparent manner.

We realise that you may wish to have a discussion with the complainants about their complaints but you will appreciate that some complainants only wish to submit their complaint and do not wish to enter into any further dialogue about it and, if this is the case, we need to ensure that we protect their privacy. With this in mind, we would suggest that we provide a link within the Airports response to the complainant with all the relevant contact details of the FACC membership that the complainants may need in order to take their complaint further. This way, if they do wish to have a discussion with the FACC, they can reach out to you directly.

I trust you agree that the above suggestion is the most appropriate and elegant solution in the circumstances. We wish to proceed on this basis and in doing so with your agreement, will bring to an end this discussion."

Regards  
Gareth

**Action 7. - Geoff Marks to provide Inspectors Report.**

Monday, April 8, 2024

Dear FACC Secretary,

Re my FACC action to identify the source of a recommendation that heavier aircraft types that exceed a 98dB noise threshold be precluded from using Farnborough airport.

This recommendation is at paragraph 11.30.5 in the Inspector's report on objections to the 2001/2011 draft Local Plan. This says, "*No flying (should take place) by aircraft with an average EPNdB greater than 98.9 dB at Maximum take-off weight*".

It appears that the Inspector's recommendation was not carried forward into the Legal agreement between Rushmoor BC and TAG. However, the general principle did apply given the early banning of Chapter 2 aircraft.

Rushmoor's current Local Plan at paragraph 7.118 anticipates the ICAO certified noise standard being reduced/tightened by 7 dB below the Chapter 4 level. This has now happened. However, it is unclear how Rushmoor will address the consequences, as required by the Local Plan, when determining the current planning application for changes in the pattern and number of aircraft movements.

I suggest that you also draw the member's attention to the last sentence in paragraph 7.120 This says, "*Aircraft exceeding this (unspecified) limit, as measured at a defined location, would be subject to an appropriate financial penalty, with such fines contributing to the Farnborough Airport Community Environment Fund. Any such penalty will be set at a level designed to deter regular non-compliance but will give some scope for a small number of exceedances annually in exceptional circumstances*".

I have copied this to Richard Ward in the expectation that he will be happy to brief the FACC ex-committee on Rushmoor's undertakings, as set out in the local Plan narratives at paragraphs 7.118 and 7.120.

Kind regards

Geoff

**Geoffrey Marks OBE**

Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc

**Response from Richard Ward**

Tuesday, April 9, 2024

Dear Secretary,

I refer to the email from Geoff Marks dated Monday, April 8, 2024.

The recommendations of the Rushmoor Borough Council Local Plan Review 1996 Inspectors Report were carried forward.

The Rushmoor Local Plan Review (1996-2011), adopted in August 2000 contained Policy FA2.2(A) that contained a restriction of:-

No flying by aircraft with an average EPNdB greater than 98.9 at maximum take-off weight.

These recommendations were purely for the Local Plan review at that time so were not applicable to any future legal agreement. However, the S106 legal agreement from Oct 2000 contained obligation 2c in Schedule 1 that required the establishment of a SEL, that was to be no higher than the LP Policy FA2.2 restriction on EPNdB limits.

More detail on this within the 2010 appeal documents available to view the Planning Portal, but also some commentary on this within both noise reports produced by Hepworth Acoustics available on the Council's website.

It is not appropriate for me to be addressing matters relating to the current planning application, so I respectfully decline briefing the FACC at this time.

Kind regards

RW

**Richard Ward**

Environment & Airport Monitoring Officer  
Operational Services  
Rushmoor Borough Council

Further correspondence from Geoff Marks:

Thanks for the clarification, Richard.

Kind regards

**Geoffrey Marks OBE**

Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Actions from this Meeting.**

- Action 1: FAL and BAP to respond to Geoff Marks question, see below.
- Action 2: Gareth Andrews to chase editorial changes to Churt Report.
- Action 3: Final version of the Churt Report will be issued to Members as soon as ready.

Draft



## **Appendix 4.**

### **Meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2024.**

#### **Questions from FACC Members:**

Geoff Marks - Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc – [Questions below](#).

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

None on this occasion.

#### **Questions from FACC Members:**

Geoff Marks - Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc.

1. The onset of significant community noise has been reduced from 57dBLeq 16hours to 54dBLeq16hours. Should we take it that this 54dBLeq threshold also applies when the equivalent continuous noise is evenly distributed over shorter periods of time, eg 12 hours?
2. The CAA's CAP2091 describes the process to be followed when noise impacts or benefits accrue through changes in the way the airspace is used. Crucially, it confirms that such changes can only be triggered by the Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSP) – NERL and ATC. Following the establishment of Farnborough's Class D airspace, single PBN routes were implemented whereas multiple PBN routes giving rise to respite opportunities exist at other airports. Should it be confirmed that multiple PBN routes within Farnborough's airspace are precluded, it would be helpful if ATC justify its apparent opposition to dispersion as a means of providing respite or a fairer way of sharing adverse noise impacts
3. Table 8-19 in Volume 1 of the current planning application's ES shows N65 contour areas reducing as the number of events increase. A simple explanation of this unexpected event/area relationship would be helpful.
4. The now superseded CAP 725 required the production of SEL footprints for night flights and says that they may be relevant to daytime operations. Has this advice been carried forward into CAP1616, and would their production alongside N65 contours be beneficial?