DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Council Meeting
held at Dogmersfield Primary School
13 December 2021 at 7.30 p.m.

Councillors	In Attendance	Apologies	Absent
Cllr Graham Chisnall (Chair)	✓		
Cllr Anne Fillis (Vice-chair)	✓		
Cllr Graham Leach	✓		
Cllr Sarah Miles	✓		
Cllr Rob Molloy	✓		

Clerk: Martin Whittaker

In attendance:

2 members of the public

		Action
21/112	**Welcome and apologies for absence** HDC Cllr Crookes and Dorn sent their apologies. In view of the recently announced COVID restrictions, and the risk of public meetings, the chairman asked for members support in dealing only with urgent matters at the meeting. The motion being proposed by Cllr Chisnall and seconded by Cllr Fillis, **IT WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to allow the Chairman to proceed in this way.	
21/113	**To receive and note any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and requests for dispensation for items to be discussed** None.	
21/114	**To approve the minutes of the council meetings of 8 November** The motion being proposed by Cllr Chisnall and seconded by Cllr Fillis, **IT WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to approve the minutes.	
21/115	**Matters arising from the minutes** All actions complete except: • 21/75 Plan for MS 365 implementation – Clerk - ongoing • 21/83.2 Interest bearing bank account – no suitable accounts available • 21/106.1 Add cutting of the foliage by the bridge to the list of works - Miles • 21/106.2 Draft letter to the Fisk Trust – Miles • 21/106.3 …provide contact details - Chisnall • 21/109 HDC Cllr Crookes offer to assist in better communication with police – Crookes – ongoing	

Draft 0.2

DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

21/116	**Announcements from the Chairman and Clerk** None.	
21/117	**County and district councillor's reports** Cllr Crookes had provided a written report, included as an annex A to these minutes.	
21/118	**Representations by the public** None.	
21/119	**To Consider the council's response to current planning applications**	
1.	21/02782/OUT Hybrid planning application seeking Full Planning Permission for the erection of 185 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with access, parking, landscaping, public open space and other associated works and Outline Planning Permission for the erection of up to 126 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and a flexible mixed-use neighbourhood store/cafe coworking space of up to 150sqm (Use Class E) with all matters reserved except for access | Land North Of Netherhouse Copse Hitches Lane Fleet Hampshire The motion being proposed by Cllr Chisnall and seconded by Cllr Fillis, **IT WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to object to the application on the grounds detailed in the paper. Cllr Leach will draft a letter for Hart and for the website.	**Leach**
2.	Applications not on the agenda None	
21/120	**To update members on any new planning consultations, appeals and enforcements** Cllr Leach updated members as per the supporting paper.	
21/121	**To consider a response to the HDC Community Infrastructure (CIL) consultation** The motion being proposed by Cllr Molloy and seconded by Cllr Fillis, **IT WAS RESOLVED** unanimously not to comment.	
21/122	**To receive an update on communication with HDC over the planning consultation period and Jane's Cottage** The letter confirmed that the consultation period for planning application was 21 days, but the council should ask for an extension where the closing date did not allow for discussion at a planned council meeting. The Chairman stated that HDC used to consult on tree works. He and Cllr Leach would collect evidence to present to HDC.	**Chisnall /Leach**
21/123	**Finance & Regulatory Matters**	
1.	**To note authorisation of an order by Clerk and Chairman** After consultation with the Chairman, the Clerk had placed an order for £170 for leaflet printing under Financial Regulation 4.1.	
2.	**To note the bank reconciliations** The bank reconciliations were inspected by Cllr Fillis and noted by the council. The reconciled balances as of 30 November were:	

Draft 0.2

- Unity Trust £20,796.00
- Multipay -£135.85

3. **To consider delegating approval of Clerk's extra hours to the Chairman/Vice-chair**

The motion being proposed by Cllr Chisnall and seconded by Cllr Leach, **IT WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to so extend the delegation.

4. **To authorise payments**

The motion being proposed by Cllr Leach and seconded by Cllr Miles, **IT WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to approve the following payments:

Date	Payment	Payee	£
13/12/21	APA refreshments	Auriol Wines	61.20
13/12/21	Phone box refurb	Men's Shed	125.00
22/11/21	Phone bill	Buzz Networks	5.95
15/11/21	Trees	Woodland Trust	126.90
26/11/21	Card monthly fee	Lloyds Bank	3.00
02/12/21	Tree protectors	Elixir Garden Supplies	169.98
13/12/21	Walks Leaflet	Brandtastic Ltd	170.00
27/11/21	Base salary - Nov	Martin Whittaker	350.00
08/11/21	Overpayment of Clerk's expenses	Martin Whittaker	0.40
13/12/21	Trees - supplementary	Ashbridge Nurseries	14.40
13/12/21	Salary balance	Martin Whittaker	37.93
13/12/21	Correction of overpayment in Nov	Martin Whittaker	-0.40
13/12/21	Mileage	Martin Whittaker	23.40
13/12/21	HDC election charge	Hart DC	1,547.00

Cllrs Miles and Leach were asked to authorise the payments.

21/124 **To receive a financial report**

The report was noted.

21/125 **To approve the budget and precept for 2022/23**

The motion being proposed by Cllr Chisnall and seconded by Cllr Molloy, **IT WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to approve the budget as per the submitted paper, and to set the precept at £12,697.

21/126 **To confirm the council's responsibility for the Christmas lights**

The motion being proposed by Cllr Miles and seconded by Cllr Leach, **IT WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to confirm that Cllr Molloy would be responsible for the Christmas lights on behalf of the council.

21/127 **To receive an update on the defibrillator**

The Clerk gave an update on the defibrillator, recommending that the council waited for the outcome of the supplier's testing process before taking any action.

21/128 **To consider the use of s.106 monies**

Carried over to the next meeting.

Draft 0.2

21/129	**To consider the management of Pilcot Green** In view of the recent commercial activity of Pilcot Green South, the Chairman expressed concern that others might seek to use the land for commercial purposes. The land is unregistered and is not a Village Green. Cllrs Chisnall and Fillis offered to draft a letter to the pub expressing disquiet about this and circulate it to members. Cllr Fillis offered to circulate the definitive map. A member of the public offered to search for historical documents giving information on the management of the area.	**Chisnall / Fillis** **Fillis**
21/130	**To consider making a donation to CPRE** The motion being proposed by Cllr Chisnall and seconded by Cllr Leach, **IT WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to offer a membership donation of £60 to CPRE.	
21/131	**Correspondence received** Carried over to the next meeting.	
21/132	**Information sharing** Carried over to the next meeting.	
21/133	**Date of next meeting** As the scheduled meeting would be very early in January, it was agreed to postpone the meeting to 17 January.	

Signed:

Date:

Abbreviation	In place of	Abbreviation	In place of
APA	Annual Parish Assembly	HDC	Hart District Council
CBF	Community Benefit Fund	NALC	National Association of Local Councils
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy	NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
DPC	Dogmersfield Parish Council	TBHSPA	Thames Valley Heaths Special Protection Area
HALC	Hampshire Association of Local Councils	SANG	Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace
HCC	Hampshire County Council		

Draft 0.2

Annex – Report from HDC Cllr Crookes

Shapley Heath project audit

Hart's Audit Committee agreed that an audit be carried out on the Shapley Heath project.

The scope of the audit to include:

> It is recommended that scope should address the following risks (understanding that the length of the review is not unlimited). • Assurance over the project management framework used. • Assurance over budgetary control and financial risks. • Assurance over the monitoring and reporting of financial information. • Assurance over compliance with contract procedure rules and contract management arrangements. • Assurance over the risk management framework including governance and transparency. • Assurance over information governance arrangements to include FOI, Transparency and GDPR

2022/23 Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy

Both Scrutiny and Cabinet considered the currently expected budget for next year and the medium term. It is clear that savings need to be made to balance the budget. A series of saving proposals have been identified and discussed.

At the meeting of 25th November, Council supported the "level 2" savings which Cabinet had agreed at its November meeting.

A further "level 3" savings will be presented to a meeting of councillors on Thursday 16th December along with an updated draft budget for 2022/23 and an updated medium term financial strategy.

Police and Crime Commissioner

Police and Crime Commissioner Donna Jones has launched her Police and Crime Plan 'More Police, Safer Streets', which sets the strategic direction and priorities for policing across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight for the next three years. The full Plan can be read at www.morepolicesaferstreets.com. If you have any feedback or questions please do not hesitate to contact the Commissioner.

Councillor Ken Crookes

Draft 0.2

Planning – Current Status of Ongoing Applications Affecting Dogmersfield

As At: 10th Jan 22

Planning Reference	Location	Outline	DPC Position	Status	Notes
Within Dogmersfield					
21/00626/FUL	Plough Farm Chalky Lane	Demolition of existing conservatories and erection of 2 storey rear extension to the 2 cottages.	No Objection (provided the extension does not contravene DNP Policy DNP11).	Awaiting Decision	DNP11 is the 'Dark Sky's Policy. Ecology officer has objected – area is suitable for bats. Prelim Ecology report now provided. Ecology Officer still objects – needs further information. (15th Nov)
20/03099/LDC	Pond House Church Lane	Change of Use of Land from agricultural to domestic use.	Under Consideration (submission date 9th Feb).	**Appeal**	Initial Application Refused. DPC – no position on initial application.
21/02350/HOU	Pond House Church Lane	Erection of 2 storey side extension with basement.	Objected	Refused	Revision of Application 21/01435/HOU
21/02562/FUL	Emily's Farm Rye Common	Continued siting of temporary agricultural workers dwelling	Objected	Refused	Temporary building first granted permission in 2012 (for 3 years). Application for extension in Nov 2017 not

Planning Reference	Location	Outline	DPC Position	Status	Notes
					determined. Breach of Planning Control issued in July 2021. New Application submitted Oct 2021 and Refused.
Outside Dogmersfield					
20/02740/FUL	Rye Common (Crondall PC)	Blue Bell Lodge - Temporary change of use of land to allow the retention of a shed, kennels and storage containers for a period of 18 months.	No comment	Awaiting Decision	No objection from Crondall PC.
21/02782/OUT	Neatherhouse Copse (Grove Farm) (*Crookham Village PC)*	increase the number of dwellings in Phase 3 by 105. No expansion to the area of the site is planned.	Objected	Awaiting Decision	

DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Projects for 2022/23

V1 11/1/22

I'd like us to agree the list of these projects we wish to commit to for the next financial year (and beyond if any cannot be completed in the financial year) and the councillors responsible, so that work can get underway and monies able to be committed that are fully authorised by a proper meeting.

I would imagine that many of these projects will have to be initiated on the basis that preliminary work will have to be undertaken to fully scope out the details and costs before a full go ahead can then be authorised at a subsequent meeting, but I'm keen we make a start as soon as possible. Accordingly, the following list is my first cut for discussion of those projects I suggest we commit to achieving during FY 2022/23 (with necessary run-ons into 2024 if required) with the aim being that each of these would have an initial budget agreed (where necessary) to enable any required definition work to be carried out prior to full approval. My suggested list for discussion is:

1. Road safety
    a) Revised signage, barriers and markings at the A287/Chalky Lane junction
    b) Revised markings and signage in and around the bridge over the Hart in the village centre
    c) Purchase and installation of a Speed Indication Device (SID)
2. Maintenance
    a) Essential ditch and verge work
    b) Continued support to community work groups
    c) Improve chicanes on Chatter Alley and Church Lane as part of 2b above
3. Environment
    a) Complete work on ownership issue concerning Pilcot Green (S & N) to enable decision to be taken
    b) Complete studies on footpath options across Pilcot Green S to enable decision to be taken
    c) Install 2 general waste bins and provide for their ongoing costs
    d) Further footpath work?
4. Policy
    a) Carry out a review of the Conservation Area status
5. Heritage
    a) Produce an illustrated heritage map of the Parish and install in notice board (plus website)
6. Comms/Engagement
    a) Complete work on the website
    b) Move all councillors over to MS365

I am bound to have overlooked some items so please review the above and get back ahead of the meeting so that we have a full list - we will also have to be clear at the meeting as to the funding source for each line item - whether council or Community Benefit Fund - or some combination.

Graham Chisnall
Chairman

Martin Whittaker - Dogmersfield

From: farnboroughnoise@gmail.com
Sent: 19 December 2021 13:43
To: clerk@alfoldparishcouncil.co.uk; townclerk@alton.gov.uk; clerk@beechpc.com; clerk@bentleyparishcouncil.co.uk; clerk@bentworthparishcouncil.org; clerk@binstedparishcouncil.org.uk; bramleyparish@gmail.com; clerk.bramshill@btconnect.com; busbridgepc@gmail.com; jasonsimper@chawtonparishcouncil.org; clerk@churchcrookham.org.uk; churt_pc@btinternet.com; clerk@cranleighpc.org; clerk@crondall-pc.gov.uk; dockenfieldclerk@hotmail.co.uk; Martin Whittaker - Dogmersfield; clerk@dummerparishcouncil.gov.uk; dunsfoldparishclerk@btconnect.com; elsteadpc.clerk@gmail.com; office@elvethamheath-pc.org.uk; clerk@ewhurstellensgreen-pc.gov.uk; clerk@ewshotpc.com; town.clerk@farnham.gov.uk; clerk@frensham-pc.gov.uk; clerk@froyleparishcouncil.org.uk; office@godalming-tc.gov.uk; info@grayshott-pc.gov.uk; joss.bigmore@guildford.gov.uk; clerkofhpc@outlook.com; admin@hartleywintney-pc.gov.uk; clerk@hascombeparishcouncil.co.uk; town.clerk@haslemeretc.org; clerk@headleypc.co.uk; clerk.heckfield@gmail.com; clerk@hook.gov.uk; clerk.mattingley@parish.hants.gov.uk; clerk@medsteadpc.org; clerk@newnham-parish.org.uk; andy.beams@normandyparishcouncil.gov.uk; clerk@odiham.org.uk; clerk@oldbasing.gov.uk; peperharowclerk@gmail.com; clerk@pirbright-pc.gov.uk; prestoncandovernutleypc@candovervalley.org; clerk@puttenham-pc.gov.uk; clerk@rotherwick.org.uk; chairman@saspc.info; clerk@shalfordpc.org.uk; clerk.swparishcouncil@gmail.com; helyn.clack@surreycc.gov.uk; alan.mcclafferty@surreyheath.gov.uk; thursley_pc@btinternet.com; clerk@tilford-pc.gov.uk; clerk@uptongreyparishcouncil.co.uk; info@whitehilltowncouncil.gov.uk; Winchfieldparishclerk@outlook.com; clerk@witley-pc.gov.uk; cllrayesha.azad@woking.gov.uk; clerk@wonershparish.org; worldhamparishclerk@gmail.com; clerk@worplesdon-pc.gov.uk
Subject: Farnborough Airport/CAA Post Implementation Review
Attachments: Airspace consultation 2014 v3.pdf

Dear all,

I contacted most of you a couple of months ago regarding the Farnborough Airport Post Implementation Review that is due to start in February 2022. I have now added a few of the local borough councils to the distribution list. Many of you and your parishioners/constituents will be aware of the increase in aircraft noise and those nearer the airport will be aware of the emissions and pollution. In summary, the number of private jets flying to/from Farnborough has been increasing. In February 2020, the CAA implemented new controlled airspace around Farnborough and this has resulted in more aircraft noise and areas that were once quiet now being frequently overflown.

The CAA consultation regarding the airspace changes in 2014 was poor with very little engagement and an extremely low response rate (0.5%) and those who did respond were against it (99%). The CAA is required to carry out a Post Implementation Review a year after the changes were implemented but this was understandably delayed due to Covid. Despite the PIR being due to start in February, the CAA has provided no information regarding the scope of the PIR, other than to say it's covered by a 280 page technical document (CAP1616). There has been no engagement with residents, councils or any stakeholders. The Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee has also not been able to clarify the scope of the review and the next meeting of the FACC is not scheduled until after the proposed start of the PIR.

I have written to Richard Moriarty (CEO of the CAA) but the response didn't address the key points. I will be writing to him again this week (let me know if you want copies of correspondence). I have also written to local MPs who have been supportive.

The urgent issue is that the scope of the PIR has still not been provided and there has been no engagement with stakeholders. Basic questions such as when and how to respond to the PIR haven't been explained. It isn't clear if the PIR will include noise from jets only or other aircraft now impacted by the airspace changes. It isn't clear if noise will be measured just within 3 miles of Farnborough or areas further away that are now impacted by aircraft noise. The PIR cannot be effective if it isn't run properly.

I urge you to write to MPs to request their support in ensuring the PIR includes:

- Noise impact of all aviation – not just aircraft using Farnborough Airport
- All geographic areas in the original consultation (Surrey, Hampshire, East Sussex, Isle of Wight, part of east Dorset, and a small part of south Berkshire) not just close to the airport
- Safety of uncontrolled airspace as well as newly controlled airspace
- Accessibility and utilisation of controlled airspace regarding 1) Gliders, 2) General Aviation
- Pollution caused by the airport and aircraft (new legislation since 2014 consultation)
- Emissions caused by the airport and aircraft (new legislation since 2014 consultation)

The original consultation documentation was several hundred pages long. I have picked out key points in a 8-page summary (attached). In the past few weeks I've attended several parish council meetings to explain the situation with Farnborough and the airspace changes as it is somewhat complex. If you'd like me to talk to representatives, please let me know.

Regards,

Colin Shearn
Farnborough Noise

Summary of Farnborough Airport Airspace Consultation documentation – 2000 to Present

Sections

1. Key messages
2. History
3. Summary of documents available
4. Review of Part A
5. Review of Part B
6. Review of Airspace Consultation Feedback
7. Review of Proposed Airspace Design
8. Further clarification needed

1) Key Messages

The consultation process was not effective in eliciting feedback from stakeholders. Only approximately 0.5% of public consulted responded.

There was no support from any stakeholders for the proposed airspace change apart from Farnborough Airport.

The way the number of people overflown and the impact of noise on them has been calculated is misleading at best.

The impact of noise from General Aviation and other aviation (military, commercial non-Farnborough traffic) was not adequately considered.

Pollution and the effect of emissions on climate change were not adequately considered in the consultation (legislation on both has changed since consultation).

Safety within controlled airspace has been achieved at the expense of safety outside controlled airspace.

The PIR that starts in February 2022 needs to be properly communicated, cover the issues caused by the airspace changes and fully engage all stakeholders, particularly members of the public.

See last page for list of acronyms

2) History

Oct. 2000 – Airport granted permission to operate "business aviation and related activities" (mainly private jets).

2003 - TAG Aviation took over the management of business flight operations at Farnborough Airport.

March 2008 – TAG granted permission on appeal to increase number of weekend flights from 2,500 to 5,000 per annum.

April 2009 - TAG published their Masterplan for the Airport.

June 2009 – TAG applied to increase the number of flights from 28,000 to 50,000 per annum. Rushmoor Borough Council (RBC) refused.

Feb. 2011 - Secretary of State overruled RBC and granted 50,000 flights a year within which 8,900 can be at weekends. There is no limit on the number of flights in a given day.

Oct. 2012 – Airspace Change Process (ACP) was first presented to the FACC.

Feb. 2014 - Public Consultation on the ACP launched.

May 2014 – Public Consultation on the ACP ended.

Nov. 2014 - CAA published results of ACP consultation.

2015 - ACP Plan produced by TAG.

July 2018 – CAA approved the ACP Plan.

June 2019- ACP challenged through Judicial Review by Lasham Gliding Association. The decision ruled in favour of the ACP.

Sept. 2019 – Farnborough Airport bought by MIRA (Macquarrie Infrastructure and Real Assets).

Feb. 2020 – ACP agreed by CAA was implemented.

March 2020 – Covid-19 travel restrictions initiated causing significant reduction in flight movements nationwide.

Feb. 2021 - Post Implementation Review (PIR) of ACP should have started. Delayed by impact of Covid-19 on aviation transport. PIR now due to start in February 2022 and is expected to last for a year.

Aug. 2021 - Farnborough Airport flight movements have returned to pre-Covid levels.

The purpose of the PIR is to determine whether the original objectives of the ACP have been met.

The dates and material for the consultation stages are on the CAA website - https://www.caa.co.uk/Commercial-industry/Airspace/Airspace-change/Decisions/Farnborough-Airport-airspace-change-proposal/

3) Summary of documents available:

Part A covered the introduction to the ACP - https://publicapps.caa.co.uk/docs/33/E05-Farnborough_ACP_Part_A_Final_28_1_14_1347.pdf

Parts B, C & D covered three geographically distinct regions. Part B is the area nearest Farnborough where aircraft are below 4,000ft - https://www.caa.co.uk/uploadedFiles/CAA/Content/Standard_Content/Commercial_industry/Airspace/Files/Farnborough_ACP_Part_B_Final_Consultation.pdf

Part C covered areas further out between 4,000ft – 7,000ft. Part D covered changes around Southampton and Bournemouth.

Part E was specifically aimed at those with an aviation interest, for example pilots, aerodrome operators and airspace users with a technical background.

After the consultation, a feedback report was produced in November 2014 - https://www.caa.co.uk/uploadedFiles/CAA/Content/Standard_Content/Commercial_industry/Airspace/Files/Farnborough/b.%20Farnborough%20ACP%20Feedback%20Report%20Part%20A.pdf

A proposed airspace design was produced in 2015 - https://www.caa.co.uk/uploadedFiles/CAA/Content/Standard_Content/Commercial_industry/Airspace/Files/Farnborough-ACP-Feedback-Report.pdf

4) Review of Part A document - Consultation Overview

The original consultation was focussed on aviation organisations and not on the general public.

4. Consultation overview

4.1. The objective of this consultation is to enable us to collect as much information as possible about what all the stakeholders want from the airspace.

4.2. To that end this consultation document explains how aircraft currently use the airspace, and what effects the proposed changes are likely to have. We also explain the constraints within which we must work.

4.3. The views we seek include those from:

- Farnborough airport users that fly through the airspace
- Southampton and Bournemouth airport users that fly through the airspace
- Representatives of people living under all these flight-paths, for example where the new flight-paths might reduce over-flight, and where they might increase over-flight
- Environmental or special interest groups; and
- GA and recreational flyers such as private pilots, gliders and balloonists.

4.4. This consultation is, however, open to all and we would welcome views from anyone who has an interest, whether an individual or representing a group or organisation.

One of the primary objectives of the ACP was to reduce the number of people overflown though some people would be overflown a lot more. The suggestion below implies that people who will be more overflown will suffer less noise because the aircraft are higher. This is misleading as there is very little difference in height pre/post ACP as it is constrained by higher airspace controlled by Heathrow and Gatwick. It should be understood that FAL is continuing to increase flight numbers towards full capacity (32,000 movements at present up to 50,000).

> **10.3.** Environmentally, our proposal will narrow the areas where most impact is felt, reducing the population significantly affected, in line with Government guidance. However, it also means that those below the narrower band would be over-flown more often. In some cases, our aircraft would over-fly new locations, in other cases there would be a reduction or removal of aircraft over-flight due to this proposal. In general, if locations get over-flown more often due to this proposal, the aircraft would usually be at a higher altitude. Aircraft that are higher appear smaller and quieter to someone on the ground.

The ACP forecasts longer flight paths and higher fuel burn than before e.g. northerly arrivals now do a circuit over the south of Farnborough before turning north again to land. (A 10.22/23/24). Estimated increase of 1,700t CO2 - 2019 flights forecast.

10.16 claims 345,000 fewer people would be overflown at lower altitudes (Part B near Farnborough). NOTE: NEED TO UNDERSTAND HOW "OVERFLOWN" IS CALCULATED. NOISE CARRIES SEVERAL MILES FROM THE OVERFLOWN AREA.

Four methods were considered for noise management below 7,000ft (A 10.9).

- Method A: Reduce the overall number of people overflown at low altitudes
- Method B: Vary the areas over-flown at low altitudes by having more than one route to or from the same runway heading in the same direction. This is sometimes known as a 'respite routes' system
- Method C: For departing aircraft, climb them higher, quicker
- Method D: For arriving aircraft, keep them higher, for longer

Method B was discounted. Methods C & D are hardly relevant due to Heathrow and Gatwick controlled airspace height restrictions above Farnborough ACP. Climbing faster is noisier.

The expectation was that General Aviation (GA) would use Farnborough's controlled airspace. The only consideration for GA was for Lasham Gliding Association, aircraft transiting directly over Farnborough Airport and a transit section north east of Farnborough adjacent to Heathrow airspace. (Section 9). No consideration was given for the increased noise of almost all GA (including commercial aircraft) flying below ACP and often at very low altitude due to ground height. See GA note at end.

The consultation area covered Surrey, Hampshire, East Sussex, Isle of Wight, part of east Dorset, and a small part of south Berkshire. Approximately 3m population.

5) Reviews of Part B document – Changes below 4,000ft

Objectives:

The stated objectives were:

> 3.5. Maintaining Farnborough's competitive position in the UK and international market is important both for the airport and for the local communities that benefit from having a commercially successful airport as a neighbour.

In other words, the ACP's main objective was to support the growth of Farnborough Airport. It's worth noting that Rushmoor Borough Council objected to the original plans and there is little evidence of the airport's presence (compared to other uses) significantly benefiting the area since most profit is offshored and the majority of Farnborough Airport's revenue is from the sale of fuel that is untaxed and has no duty applied.

> **Overall benefit**
>
> 3.17. Our assessment of impacts is based on our interpretation of the Government's priorities described in Part A, which focusses on minimising the numbers of people over-flown by aircraft flying below 4,000ft. Whilst the proposed design would have both positive and negative impacts, we believe that by reducing the net number of people overflown at low altitudes and by avoiding disruption of GA areas as far as practicable, our design achieves the best balance. We therefore believe that the change is justified. In the questions below we ask about the principles behind our design decisions, and in Section 4 we are seeking local views in order to help determine whether our design can be improved further.

The original and forecast flight densities are shown in charts B3-B11. Numbers are average flights per day in a month (Sept 2012).

1. Figure B3: All commercial flights (up to 20,000ft) density plot with National Parks and AONBs
2. Figure B4: Farnborough departures and arrivals (up to 20,000ft) density plot
3. Figure B5: Arrows/dotted lines show Runway 06 departure flows (Radar data shows all Farnborough air traffic below 4,000ft)
4. Figure B6: Arrows/dotted lines show Runway 24 departure flows (Radar data shows all Farnborough air traffic below 4,000ft)
5. Figure B7: Arrows/dotted lines show Runway 06 arrival flows (Radar data shows all Farnborough air traffic below 4,000ft)
6. Figure B8: Arrows/dotted lines show Runway 24 arrival flows (Radar data shows all Farnborough air traffic below 4,000ft)
7. Figure B9: Proposed Farnborough departures from both runways below 4,000ft
8. Figure B10: Farnborough arrivals to Runway 06 below 4,000ft
9. Figure B11: Farnborough arrivals to Runway 24 below 4,000ft

NOTE: FOR A FAIR COMPARASON, CHART B4 SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITH ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES UP TO 4,000ft NOT 20,000ft.

Figure B6 1.4. shows that the impact on GA was only considered in a subset of the overall area (blue dotted area Lasham) and not the wider ACP area.

6) Review of document - Airspace Consultation Feedback Report Part A (Nov 2014)

Projected benefits prior to consultation:

- Improve overall efficiency of the airspace
- Increase safety
- Reduce environmental impact

14 week's consultation between February - May 2014. Primary response via consultation website, some via airport contacts, MPs, etc.

2,699 stakeholders responded (Aviation groups, councils, MPs, environmental groups, public).

Populations in areas with responses (23% of responses from other postcodes throughout the UK)

Area	Postcode	Households	People	Public responses to Part B
Wormley area	GU8	6,960	17,656	20
Farnham	GU9	12,370	29,837	26
W, S & E of Farnham	GU10	8,835	22,584	132
Hindhead area	GU26	2,963	7,355	
Alton area	GU34	12,338	29,884	34
New Alresford area	SO24	4,700	11,417	
Odiham area	RG29	2,476	7,191	19
TOTAL		**48,166**	**118,744**	**231**

The above table shows that there was very little response from households under the new controlled airspace below 4,000ft (0.5%).

The main concerns raised were:

Aviation stakeholders:

1. Access to the proposed airspace
2. Justification for the proposed changes
3. Safety issues caused by funnelling or compression of non-Farnborough aircraft around or beneath the proposed airspace

Other stakeholders:

1. Environmental impact (primarily noise)
2. Justification for the proposed changes
3. Safety

Responses to Part B by question category:

Question	No of responses	Supporting
Justification	1,486	2%
GA Impact	568	1%
Safety	867	1%
Environment	1,786	1%
Economic	132	1%

The table above shows that there was very little support for Part B of the ACP (areas overflown below 4,000ft).

Responses to Parts B, C, D & E by question category:

Question	Borough		County		NATS		Airports	
	No of responses	Support	No of responses	Support	No of responses	Support	No of responses	Support
Justification	10	20%	1	0%	14	7%	9	33%
GA Impact	3	0%	2	0%	10	10%	4	0%
Safety	5	40%	1	0%	25	8%	5	0%
Environment	25	8%	1	0%	10	0%	5	20%
Economic	2	0%	1	0%	3	0%	1	0%

47 MPs invited to respond. 3 responses. Data not statistically significant.

The table above shows that there was very little support for all parts of the ACP at any height, even from NATS and airport operators.

Overall, the consultation demonstrated that there was very little engagement from all stakeholders and it can hardly be seen as an effective consultation. From the stakeholders who did respond, there was very little support for the proposed changes.

Summary of GA: Apart from the impact on Lasham, aircraft transiting directly over Farnborough Airport and a transit section north east of Farnborough adjacent to Heathrow airspace (Section A9), there was little consideration of the impact of GA on the area.

Responses to Part E (Figure 67: Analysis of Question E15 Part 1) suggest the majority of powered GA would request permission to fly through the ACP. This has not happened. The majority (approx. 95%) fly under it or around it. With ground heights up to 700ft, this means that many aircraft are flying between 1,000ft and 1,700ft from the ground.

NOTE: AS WELL AS GA, COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT ARE USING AIRSPACE BELOW 2,500ft.

7) <u>Review of document Part B – The Proposed Airspace Design (2015)</u>

The ACP design focussed on:

A) Environment – the report suggests that under the ACP, 35% (199,000) less people would be overflown below 4,000ft though some would be overflown significantly more. It does not place a value on the fact that many people that were not previously overflown are now overflown. Nor does it recognise the relative noise difference of previously quiet rural areas with low background noise now being overflown (35dB increased to 70dB) compared to larger numbers of people in urban areas being overflown (55dB increased to 70dB). The report also suggests that the ACP will result in aircraft climbing quicker and reducing noise. However, aircraft climbing faster make more noise and the ability to climb faster is no different in the past compared to the ACP.

Nor does the report properly consider the noise impact of GA that was previously flying up to 3,500ft and is now flying at about 1,700ft. This is half the height and therefore four times noisier than in the past. Data presented in Figure 19 (B43) is not representative of what is happening with GA. For example, a light aircraft on a training flight may fly from Fairoaks and circle 15 times for 30 minutes over the same area of South Farnham – is that recorded a one flight or 15? In any case, aircraft

should be flying as high as possible to minimise noise disturbance on the ground, particularly over National Parks/AONB where the Air Navigation Guidance 2017 states aircraft should aim to stay above 7,000ft where possible. Many GA light aircraft are old (typically 30 – 40 years old) and were built when there was no concern regarding noise. Many are as noisy or noisier than modern jets so their impact needs to be properly measured.

Part A Consultation suggested there would be an increase in CO2 emissions due to the need to fly further to reduce the number of people being overflown. The Feedback Report (Sect 6.6) suggests there will be no change to emissions. NOTE: THIS SHOULD BE VALIDATED AS A LOT OF AIRCRAFT ARE CIRCLING OVER FARNHAM.

The reports used a video library of jet noises at different heights (Sect 6.12) but these were large commercial jets (737/A320) and not indicative of many aircraft in this area. Noise should be measured at various representative locations where aircraft are below 4,000ft (All aircraft - Farnborough, GA, commercial & military) to assess the overall noise burden on the public rather than just a sub-set.

The impact on air quality was largely excluded from consideration as aircraft are generally above 1,000ft and government guidelines suggest the impact of aircraft pollution is negligible. However, the height is irrelevant and the World Health Organisation has recently halved the safe levels of many atmospheric pollutants. The landmark ruling relating to the death of Ella Kissi-Debrah means that air quality should be properly considered. Many of the pollution monitoring stations around the airport are recording pollution at double and sometimes four times the WHO safe levels.

B) Access to airspace – the report highlights the importance of Farnborough control tower giving GA access to the controlled airspace to reduce funnelling and compression resulting in more noise for people on the ground. For whatever reason, GA isn't using the controlled airspace (probably because it's easier to fly below/around it than to get permission to fly through it). This needs to be investigated and understood. The noisiest of all aircraft (apart from Chinooks) are commercial helicopters at 1,700ft and 200mph that fly under controlled airspace 6 – 10 times a day. They really should not be using unrestricted airspace.

C) Safety – The report suggests that the controlled airspace reduces the workload on pilots and air traffic management. I'm sure this is true for aircraft using Farnborough Airport but the changes significantly reduce the safety of aircraft outside controlled airspace. Take a section of controlled airspace such as CTA4 above south Farnham. The controlled airspace base is 2,500ft. GA aircraft will give a 200ft margin of error to ensure they don't stray into controlled airspace. That reduces the available height to 2,300ft. Aircraft in this area must fly at least 1,000ft above the ground. Since the ground level in this area is between 100ft and 500ft, aircraft must fly at a minimum of 1,500ft (many don't). The height available to aircraft is therefore between 1,500ft and 2,300ft. That is a very small range of height for all GA to be operating in, especially when commercial helicopters flying at 200mph and microlights at 40mph are using the same space.

The report also suggests that the CAA has reduced the amount of airspace needed as a result of the consultation by 20% (land area). However, the initial area in the consultation (part A & B) was excessive given the fact that each flight will fly over exactly the same track to within a few metres. I suspect the initial proposal included this sacrificial area knowing it could be relinquished without impact.

8) Further clarification needed:

NEED A MAP OF FARNBOROUGH FLIGHTS BELOW 4,000ft SHOWING NP/AONB (SIMILAR TO CHART B3). ALSO NEED ONE SHOWING GA BELOW 4,000ft (SIMILAR TO CHART B4).

NOISE IMPACT OF GA NEEDS TO BE MEASURED DUE TO FUNELLING AND COMPRESSION. CONSIDERATION IN THE ACP WAS ONLY GIVEN TO ACCESS RATHER THAN NOISE.

NOISE OF ALL AIRCRAFT SHOULD BE MEASURED TO ASSESS TOTAL NOISE BURDEN ON THE PUBLIC.

WHAT WERE CHINOOK (AND OTHER MILITARY AIRCRAFT) FLIGHTS IN BASE DATA VS NOW? SEEM TO BE A LOT MORE NOW AT ANTISOCIAL TIMES. USUALLY FLYING AT 1,500 – 2,000ft.

WHAT WERE COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT (HEATHROW/GATWICK) FLIGHTS IN BASE DATA VS NOW? SEEM TO BE A LOT MORE COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT AT LOWER HEIGHT.

HOW IS “OVERFLOWN” CALCULATED? DIRECTLY OVERHEAD OR WITHIN 2 MILES? NEED A SIMPLE EXPLANATION OF “NOISE ENVELOPES”.

DATA IN APPENDIX B PROPOSED AIRSPACE DESIGN IS INCORRECT. AVERAGE FORECAST MOVEMENTS (WEEKDAY AND WEEKEND) ARE MUCH LOWER THAN REALITY, ESPECIALLY WEEKENDS. THEREFORE, EFFECT OF CURRENT FLIGHTS IS MUCH GREATER.

Colin Shearn
December 2021

TAG
ACP
CAA
General Aviation
MIRA
PIR
FACC
RBC
FAL