

FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON
13th February 2025

at

Hart District Council Offices – for Members & Public
and

Online with MS Teams – for Members and streamed Live on FACC/YouTube.

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

Participation: This Meeting	Last Meeting	Best
23 FACC Members.	23 FACC Members.	25
3 Members of the Public/Guests.	1 Member of the Public/Guests.	22
19 Viewers followed the live-stream	24 Viewers followed the live-stream.	24

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

Thanks to Hart DC Facilities and IT and FAL IT for all their support.

Item 2. Minutes of Meeting held on 21st November 2024 – Actions and Matters Arising.

The Minutes of the meeting had been circulated to Members.

For actions from the Meeting - please see Appendix 2.

The Minutes from 21st November Meeting were approved.

Matters arising from the Minutes:

There were none.

Matters arising from Actions:

There were none. Please see Appendix 2 for actions update.

Item 3. Chairmans Introduction & Opening Remarks.

The Chaiman welcomed the Members, Members of the Public in the Chamber and online.

The Chairman explained what he wanted to achieve with the closed meeting to immediately follow the main meeting and indicated this was to be confidential and subject to Chatham House Rules.

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

It has only been 2 months or so since the last meeting so little to report.

Outturn reportable traffic for 2024 was 29,702 ATMs. This was down 5% on prior year. For the non-weekdays, our reportable ATMs were down 3%.

In comparison growth was observed at Luton and RAF Northolt, both of which are more capacity constrained on non-weekdays than they are during the week.

This is against the backdrop of an overall market which grew by 1%. FAL clearly operates in a competitive market.

In the aircraft category between 50-80 tonnes, ATMs were 8.6% higher and showing a 1.5% increase on a non-weekday basis. FAL recorded 265 non-weekday ATMs against a cap of 270.

Due to FAL planning constraints, demand management is now effectively being initiated from September each year.

In terms of investment, FAL is continuing to significantly invest in our facilities.

Regarding the £9 million investment on the FlexJet lounge, structural works have commenced. FAL continues to expect the facility to be operational in 2026. FlexJet has a significant number of new aircraft on order.

FAL continues to progress multiple enquiries for hangar and maintenance facilities from third parties. A number of these opportunities, if successful, will bring incremental employment to the local area.

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.

FAL is in discussion with the DfT about becoming a Designated UK airport (in accordance with Section 35 of the Aviation Act) reflecting its important role as part of the UK's national infrastructure. The Chair will talk a little about this.

FAL responded to the DfT's consultation on higher rates of APD saying it supported paying our fair share of UK tax however any changes should not be anti-competitive, discriminatory or used to suppress demand.

FAL saw a 45% increase in SAF sales in 2024, representing just over 3% of total sales.

From the 1st January fuel supplies are part of the UK-wide SAF mandated 2% blend. FAL also holds stocks of the 35% blend.

Simon was pleased to report that the Aviator Hotel was again voted No 2 in the UK on Tripadvisor.

In terms of community engagement of note FAL was delighted to again sponsor the Farnborough Half marathon.

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

Very happy to take any questions.

Questions arising: -

Jules Crossley – Asked, are all aircraft operating from FAL capable of using the higher 35% SAF?

Simon Geere – Responded – yes generally most modern corporate aircraft were able to use both the 5% and 35% SAF.

He added the use was more likely an operational choice or dictated by the operators manual for the specific type. Some lenders are specifying the use of SAF.

James Radley – Asked did Simon think air passenger duty (APD) increases announced by the Government were designed to suppress demand or raise additional tax?

Simon Geere – Responded – he felt the action, in terms of FAL, was to raise additional tax and not suppress demand.

Item 5. Farnborough Airport Reports – Gareth Andrews

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

Questions arising:

Jenny Radley – Why is there a higher proportion of heavier aircraft using the Airport at weekends?

Simon Geere – Responded this is not the case, the ratio for weekdays and weekends is very similar. He went on to say the Airport needs to manage operational limits for the weekends so this may have an effect on numbers.

Action 1: Jenny Radley asked if more information was available on this. Simon Geere agreed FAL would look to see if this could be made available. Please attached, Appendix 5.

Note from the Secretary – The request made at the last meeting for the RBC website to provide more details such as: aircraft type, operation (arrival or departure), and runway, on their quarterly Complaints Report tables, to enable complainants to identify their own complaints on the reports, has been agreed between FAL and RBC.

Item 6. Noise Sub-Committee Report – Gareth Andrews

Gareth Andrews – The NSC covered the typical complaints responses looking at various types of complaints from standard to non-standard.

Possible sites for the next siting/reports are being reviewed concentrating on the east side of the Airport.

The NSC received an information session on airspace and what it looks like in the context of Farnborough Airport as well as the adjacent airspace. This was well received by members; FAL will look to do a short series voiced over by Rachel to enable a greater understanding of airspace in the wider community which will be uploaded to FACC in due course.

The NSC has received the revised Church Crookham update which is headed in the right direction and will be to be distributed to Members shortly after the meeting.

The Ewshot Noise Monitoring Report is underway and will be reviewed at the next NSC.

Questions arising:

Jenny Radley – Was concerned at the time it took to issue the Church Crookham Noise Monitoring Report. The information the reports contain is valuable.

Gareth Andrews – Said FAL now has a more efficient process in place which should allow reports to be published in a more timely manner.

Jenny Radley – Could the Information Reports please not have black backgrounds (in order to make them printable)?

Gareth Andrews – Agreed.

David Munro – Thought the NSC ‘was proving it’s worth!’ But that the noise monitoring reports were taking too long to edit and issue to interested parties.

David Munro – Feels the Reports should include all aircraft movements and not just those operating into and out of FAB. He noted that this was done by other airports but asked why FAB could not be different?

Simon Geere – The report was commissioned to monitor the noise of aircraft operating into and out of Farnborough that over the specific areas for which the data is being gathered. Other flights were not in scope. He agreed other noise information was also collected at the same time but information relating to these movements was not available to FAL. So, identifying all aircraft would not be easy.

David Munro – Said he understood that.

The Chairman – Felt it was not the role of FAL, when producing a noise report, to present data for aircraft operating into other airports. However, he could see the benefit of mapping data reflect the total activity over a monitoring site. There is no central resource looking at this matter.

Action 2: The Chairman took an action to raise the suggestion that when gathering noise data of aircraft operating into a specific airport, the process should monitor all aircraft in that airspace and not just those aircraft operating into that airport, with UKACC.

Jules Crossley & Geoff Marks – Both felt if the information related to and identified all aircraft in the airspace, the attendant noise profile could be allocated to a particular airport.

Marwan Khalek – Observed that, that the role of the FACC was to review the impact of FAL not that caused by other airports. There would be additional cost. What would the additional information be used for? He felt this level of data monitoring was not in the FACC remit.

Jules Crossley – Disagreed, all aircraft movement were interlinked.

James Radley – Agreed with Marwan Khalik; it was important for the FACC to understand the impact of FAL on local residents, businesses and the environment, nothing more. He also asked the question, what would this additional information be used for?

Les Freer – As already discussed, every airport monitors noise in a different way, it would be pointless for one airport to monitor the noise generated by aircraft operating into other airports.

Action 3: Simon Geere said FAL would ask BAP what could be done to identify other aircraft movements captured in the data. The Chairman suggested this could be topic could be taken up by the NSC.

Marwan Khalek – Felt the key question to be answered is how does monitoring the noise of aircraft operating into other airports, fall into the remit of the FACC

Item 7. Planning Application Update - Joanne Franco

As mentioned at the last meeting there was an exchange of information and discussion around the needs case, noise and the impact on the Special Protection Area (SPA). The impact on the SPA is a matter where Natural England is the Statutory body and the Council needed its response to consider the application and to complete what is called an Appropriate Assessment.

As reported, RBC had received a full response from Natural England on 6th November.

The Airport is considering its approach with Natural England, however this will take time. Given the passing of time since the application was submitted, the Airport notes that some of the reporting/modelling in the application dates back to 2019 (because it was the most representative year not skewed by COVID). FAL is updating the application material with 2024 data/modelling so that it is more current.

As this will be new data and because additional material will be provided as required by the Reg 25, further consultation will be required. The FACC, Statutory Consultees and the public will be notified accordingly.

Questions arising: -

James Radley – Stated that there were reports of a conspiracy suggesting that there was no way the involvement or a response from Natural England would delay an application for so long.

He wanted it noted for the record that through his own involvement, as a member of HDC Planning Committee, with Natural England, he very much appreciated that this was sensitive and time-consuming work. He said RBC was completely correct in taking its time to resolve the issues or concerns brought by Natural England.

Simon Geere – Added, that contrary to reports, RBC had not rejected the application. Rather, given the response from Natural England, FAL had decided to review the matter and as mentioned by Jo earlier, FAL would update information provided and modify the application.

Keith Dibble – Added there was no conspiracy, the process was transparent to all and it would take time to reach a decision.

Jenny Radley – Asked if RBC would make a statement to this effect and update the Planning website?

Action 4: Keith Dibble took an action to ensure the RBC Planning website was updated to reflect the current status of the application.

Item 8. Airspace Update – Rachel Thomas.

Please see Appendix 3, for Slides.

No update from the CAA on the PIR. CAA website last updated 23rd October 2024.

AMS/FASI-South, FAL has entered Stage 3, there is no official timeline, as it must be coordinated with the other airports and NATS. The UK Airspace Design Service (UKADS) consultation and Heathrow systemisation work has slowed Stage 3 activity. Some technical work continuing. FAL await the outcome of the UKADS consultation.

London Airspace South (Gatwick and NATS), timelines have changed slightly; Gatwick will not be submitting Stage 3 documentation for the planned 31st January Gateway as they have needed more time for the options analysis and the environmental assessment work. Further update is expected later this quarter.

UKADS Consultation is complete – 151 responses received by DFT/CAA, with broad support for the concept. DFT/CAA are saying quarter 2 for the Consultation Response.

Alex Culley – Mentioned that the Airport, earlier today, attended a local airspace users group hosted by Farnborough Air Traffic that was well attended by our neighbouring units and helps maintain good operational related communication. Next meeting will take place in the summer.

Questions arising: - There were none on this occasion.

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

Please see Appendix 4.

A question was asked by John Eriksson – Farnborough Noise Group.

John Eriksson - Bearing in mind the frequent adoption of Rushmoor Borough Council's more liberal definition of "Business aviation", which no longer requires a flight to be "as an aid to the conduct of their business", and the need for Farnborough Airport now to report a breakdown of flights to the CAA, should we now not have a better more detailed breakdown of the type of flight movements within FAL's own Environment Report. Simply stating that RBC's definition and CAA definition are different is not sufficient. The Farnborough Noise Group and I are receiving numerous questions due to this discrepancy. Residents deserve more detail and consistency.

Simon Geere – Responded - The definition of Business Aviation for the purposes of reporting data to the CAA is overly narrow and has not been updated for many years. There are also a number of inconsistencies in the data reporting of such movements across UK airports. Both these issues have been raised with the CAA. FAL reports the data required. Farnborough Airport has no plans to change its own reporting methodology.

The Chairman – Noted that there was no response at the meeting from RBC but a written response would be sought.

Action 5: Would RBC please provide a response to Mr Erikssons question.

This is provided in Appendix 4. Action Completed.

John Eriksson – If FAL expanded or changed the Environmental Report and used the new definition this would eliminate the inconsistencies and the people would not be asking the question.

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

There were none on this occasion.

Item 12 FACC Meetings in 2025.

Thursday 17th July and Thursday 20th November.

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
APD	Air Passenger Duty
ATMs	Air Traffic Movements
BAP	Bickerdike Allen Partners
CAP 1498	CAA definition of Overflight.
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.
DfT	British Government – Department for Transport.
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.
LAmx,T	The maximum A-weighted sound pressure level, normally associated with a time weighting, F (fast), or S (slow).
LARS	Lower Airspace Radar
LOAEL	Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level.
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.
OEM	Original Equipment Manufacturer
PBN	Performance-based Navigation
PIR	FAL Airspace Change Proposal, Post Implementation Review.
RBC	Rushmoor Borough Council
Reg 25	Regulation 25 is a part of the UK's planning regulations. It requires the local planning authority to comply with section 20 (8) of the Act as soon as reasonably practicable after receipt of the report of the person appointed to carry out the independent examination under section 20 of the Act.
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
UKADS	The UK Airspace Design Service
VFR	Visual Flight Rules
YTD	Year-to-date

Appendix 1.

Attendance List for Meeting on 13th February 2025

Attending:

CHAIRMAN: Colin Flack OBE In Person.
SECRETARY: Whittacre Hope In Person.

USERS (10)

Simon Geere Farnborough Airport Ltd In Person.
Les Freer Farnborough Airport Ltd In Person.
Gareth Andrews Farnborough Airport Ltd In Person.
John Whately Dassault Aviation Group Ltd Apologies Received.
Marwan Khalek GAMA Aviation Ltd In Person.
Mark Bates Gulfstream Aerospace Ltd
Ben Gleeson Farnborough International Ltd Online
Alex Culley NATS In Person
Joanne Goodall TAG Aviation Ltd Apologies Received.
Wally Epton WJE Associates In Person

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (10)

Cllr James Radley Hart District Council In Person
Cllr. Chris Dorn Hart District Council Apologies Received.
Cllr Keith Dibble Rushmoor Borough Council Online
Cllr Craig Card Rushmoor Borough Council Apologies Received – After 3pm.
Cllr Geoff Davis Guildford Borough Council Online
Cllr Rod Cooper Hampshire County Council In Person
Cllr David Lewis Surrey County Council Apologies Received.
Cllr Jacques Olmo Surrey Heath Borough Council Apologies Received.
Cllr David Munro Waverley Borough Council In Person
Cllr John Pearce Woking Borough Council Online

LOCAL INTERESTS (10)

Cllr Richard Lucas Ash Parish Council Online
Cllr Gareth Saunders Church Crookham Parish Council In Person.
TBA Crondall Parish Council Apologies Received - Alternate
Cllr Carl Turner Ewshot Parish Council Online.
Geoffrey Marks OBE FARA In Person
Cllr George Hesse Farnham Town Council Apologies Received - Alternate
Jenny Radley Fleet and Church Crookham Society In Person
Cllr David Whitcroft Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut Online
Virginia Barret Farnborough College of Technology Apologies Received - Alternate
Jules Crossley Blackwater Valley Friends of Earth Online.

Reserves/Deputies/Alternates:

Hamish Johnston	Farnborough Airport Residents Assoc	In Person
Cllr Alex Crawford	Rushmoor Borough Council	Online
Cllr Andrew Laughton	Farnham Town Council	Online Alt for George Hesse
Sarah Wood	Blackwater Valley Friends of Earth	In Person
Steven Hunt	Farnborough College of Technology	Online Alt for Virginia Barret
Tom Wilson	TAG Aviation Ltd	
Cllr Martin Sullivan	Woking Borough Council	
Astrid Angove	Crandall Parish Council	Online Alt for Crondall PC

Additional Guests:

Richard Ward	Rushmoor Borough Council	In Person
Ross McNally	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Online
Joanne Franco	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person
Matt Jago	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person
Rachel Thomas	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person
Kerry Baldwin	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person
Peter Russell	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person
Mark Sanderson	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person
Darren Blair	Farnborough Airport Ltd	In Person

Members of the Public:

John Eriksson	Farnborough Noise Group	Online
----------------------	--------------------------------	--------

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

Changes to the Committee

Users

None

Local Authorities

Cllr John Pearce	Woking Borough Council	Replaces Ann- Marie Barker.
Cllr David Lewis	Surrey County Council	David is ill - Replacement TBA

Local Interests

Cllr Gareth Ives	Crandall Parish Council	Stood down - Replacement TBA
-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------

Appendix 2.

Actions from Meeting Held on 21st November 2024 – February 2025 Update.

Action 1: Action: 'Know Your Airport Initiative' - Joanne Franco and Mark Sanderson to contact Jenny Radley and provide information.

FAL is in regular contact with Jenny Radley. Mark openly invites all Members to reach out in this regard or any community activity. Please see attached.

Completed and ongoing.

Action 2: Gareth Andrews will update and recirculate the Information Report V2.

Circulated 3rd December 2024. – **Completed.**

Action 3: The NSC will review the contents of the Information Report and feedback to the Committee.

This will be discussed at the next NSC meeting and brought to the main committee in July 2025.

Action 4: Gareth Andrews will ask if additional information can be added to the FAL reports submitted to RBC.

Gareth and Richard Ward met on 27th January. FAL and RBC agreed additional information for reporting. New form reports will commence from the next Meeting. – **Completed.**

Action 5: Gareth Andrews will confirm how other airports provide noise reporting information.

Gareth has reviewed the noise reports from a number of UK airports. This will be summarised and provided to the next NSC and then circulated to the FACC.

Action 6: Tim Mills will confirm if the information can be found on Rushmoor's website.

Jenny Radley advised that the Natural England response was available on the RBC Planning Portal from 28th November. This was included in the minutes circulated 3rd December 2024 and placed on FACC website. – **Completed.**

Action 7: David Munro and Geoff Marks will discuss the matter with Mr Eriksson and take it to the next NSC.

David Munro and Geoff Marks will meet with Mr Eriksson on 19th February 2025.

Action 8: FAL/NSC will circulate a response to the question from Mr Eriksson.

Circulated 3rd December 2024 and placed on FACC website. – **Completed.**

Action 9: Chairman to attempt to meet/speak to all Members before the next meeting.

The Chairman has had conversations with a few Members but will endeavour to speed up the process.

This action was completed by holding an additional meeting with Members immediately after this meeting. – **Completed.**

Action 10: The Chairman asks that all Members drop him an email with their reflections about the FACC past and aspirations for the future.

The Chairman has received a number of responses; thank you!

This action was completed by holding an additional meeting with Members immediately after this meeting. – **Completed.**

DRAFT

Actions from Meeting Held on 21st November 2024 – Supporting Information.

Action 1: Action: ‘Know Your Airport Initiative’ - Joanne Franco and Mark Sanderson to contact Jenny Radley and provide information.

Hi Jenny,

Just following up from the last FACC, I organise the community group tours of the Airport.

The schedule is fairly straightforward – the invited group go to our Nexus room for a tea or coffee, followed by a presentation of how the airport operates. Nothing too formal, for around about 40 minutes.

Then we take guests for a look at the terminal and hangar one.

We tend to do the tours between 10am and noon.

Previous group visits have included Rushmoor Rotary Club and Cove Women’s Institute.

The only caveat is we make it clear with visiting groups that the tour isn’t a consultation event to debate the planning application.

Feel free to put any interested local groups in touch with me and I can organise a tour.

Best wishes,

Mark


Mark Sanderson
Group Corporate Responsibility Manager

Mark openly invites all Members to reach out in this regard or any community activity.

Airspace Update FACC

13th February 2025

2020 ACP - PIR update



CAA Webpage
Last updated: 23 October 2024
Most recent update: The Farnborough Airspace Change post implementation review report has been completed and is currently under management review for approval.

Our ACP


- We currently have no timescale for Stage 3 as it must be co-ordinated with the other airports and NATS. The UKADS consultation and Heathrow systemisation work has slowed Stage 3 activity. Some technical work continuing.
- We await the outcome of the UKADS consultation

UKADS Consultation

- Complete – 151 responses received by DFT/CAA, with broad support for the concept
- DFT/CAA are saying q2 for the Consultation Response

London Airspace South (Gatwick and NATS)

Timelines have changed slightly; Gatwick will not be submitting Stage 3 documentation for the planned 31st January Gateway as they have needed more time for the options analysis and the environmental assessment work. Further update is expected later this quarter.



Ahead of the Curve

Appendix 4 - Members Questions, Questions from Members of the Public.

Questions from FACC Members:

None on this occasion.

Questions from Members of the Public.

A question from Mr Eriksson – Farnborough Noise Group.

Question

Bearing in mind the frequent adoption of Rushmoor Borough Council's more liberal definition of "Business aviation", which no longer requires a flight to be "as an aid to the conduct of their business", and the need for Farnborough Airport now to report a breakdown of flights to the CAA, should we now not have a better more detailed breakdown of the type of flight movements within FAL's own Environment Report. Simply stating that RBC's definition and CAA definition are different is not sufficient. The Farnborough Noise Group and I are receiving numerous questions due to this discrepancy. Residents deserve more detail and consistency.

Context

The 6 months figures to 31 December 2024 are not yet available, I have therefore commented on June 2024 data. CAA definitions are also attached although the relevant definitions are listed below.

CAA figures for June 2024 show "Business Aviation" movements as 412.

CAA definition of "Business Aviation" however only includes

Business aviation movements are non-commercial movements operated on aircraft of 2730kgs MTOM or greater (with no upper weight limit) conducting business operations. (e.g. aircraft owned and operated by Shell or Ford)

It does not include the other relevant aircraft categories that would also justifiably be included in the more widely used "business aviation" definition such as:

Other non-commercial movements are non-revenue earning movements by air transport operators or manufacturers for the sole purpose of moving their own personnel or stores from one place to another, for delivery, refuelling or maintenance of empty aircraft and air transport flights forced to return to base by bad weather, engine failure or other causes.

Air transport movements are landings or take-offs of aircraft engaged on the transport of passengers, cargo or mail on commercial terms. All scheduled movements, including those operated empty, loaded charter and air taxi movements are included. For the purpose of these statistics where flights are operated on a sub charter basis the operator is identified according to the flight number. In the case of code sharing and franchise services the flight is allocated to the operator who has commercial responsibility for the service.

Air taxi movement is a movement by an aircraft of less than 15 tonnes MTOM - Maximum take Off Mass - operating on a non-scheduled service. These are predominantly sole-use charter operations and could include Air Ambulance flights.

As a comparison, FAL's Environment Report for June 2025, deems all the flights on the CAA data breakdown to be "Business" other than Military -10, Flying club - 62 and other- 92 (Private - 58 and official - 34), giving a total reported of 3,073 business flights. Even the empty repositioning flights of 681 were deemed to be "business"!

Aircraft movements generating growth from business flights "for the purposes of business" in Rushmoor BC and beyond is an important distinction for residents.

Response from Farnborough Airport Ltd.

The definition of Business Aviation for the purposes of reporting data to the CAA is overly narrow and has not been updated for many years. There also appears to be many inconsistencies in the data reporting of such movements across UK airports. Both these issues have been raised with the CAA. Farnborough Airport has no plans to change its own reporting methodology.

Follow up to question received after the Meeting from Mr Eriksson.

The question has already achieved its objectives; it highlights RBC's non-business definition of 'Business Aviation' and FAL's attitude to issues within FACC. It answers questions on their behalf and not the question I asked. I asked for Environment Report definition to change, something which is in RBC's and FACC gift, not FAL. FAL should just provide what it's told to provide.

Response from RBC received after the Meeting

The Environment Reports are produced in compliance with the S106 Agreement.
The data provided reflects the definition of "Business Aviation" contained within the S106 Agreement, and RBC is satisfied with the information provided.

Note from the Secretary – The FACC has no statutory power to direct RBC or FAL to change any report. It is the role of the ACC to reach agreement with stakeholders through consensus where appropriate. It is therefore erroneous to suggest it is within the FACC's gift.

Appendix 5 - Actions from this Meeting.

- Action 1:** Action: Jenny Radley asked if more information was available on this. Simon Geere agreed FAL would look to see if this could be made available.
- Action 2:** The Chairman took an action to raise the suggestion that when gathering noise data of aircraft operating into a specific airport, the process should monitor all aircraft in that airspace and not just those aircraft operating into that airport, with UKACC.
- Action 3:** Simon Geere said FAL would ask BAP what could be done to identify other aircraft movements captured in the data. The Chairman suggested this topic could be taken up by the NSC.
- Action 4:** Keith Dibble took an action to ensure the RBC Planning website was updated to reflect the current status of the application.
- Action 5:** Would RBC please provide a response to Mr Erikssons question.

FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Actions from Meeting Held on Thursday 13th February 2024 - Update.

Action 1: Jenny Radley asked if more information was available on this. Simon Geere agreed FAL would look to see if this could be made available.

Please see below. **Action Completed.**

Action 2: The Chairman took an action to raise the suggestion that when gathering noise data of aircraft operating into a specific airport, the process should monitor all aircraft in that airspace and not just those aircraft operating into that airport, with UKACC.

Action 3: Simon Geere said FAL would ask BAP what could be done to identify other aircraft movements captured in the data. The Chairman suggested this topic could be taken up by the NSC.

Action 4: Keith Dibble took an action to ensure the RBC Planning website was updated to reflect the current status of the application.

Action 5: Would RBC please provide a response to Mr Erikssons question.

This is provided in Appendix 4 above. **Action Completed.**

Action 1: Jenny Radley asked if more information was available on this. Simon Geere agreed FAL would look to see if this could be made available.

Numbers below kindly supplied by FAL.

	Total			Weekday			Non-Weekday		
	ATMs	Over 50t	Split %	ATMs	Over 50t	Split %	ATMs	Over 50t	Split %
2022	32,598	668	2.0	23,890	496	2.1	8,708	172	2.0
2023	31,296	927	3.0	22,779	666	2.9	8,517	261	3.1
2024	29,702	1,007	3.4	21,441	742	3.5	8,261	265	3.2

DRAFT