

Hart District Council's Response to Farnborough Airport Consultation

Executive Summary

The Council is responding to Farnborough Airport Ltd (FAL) consultation on plans to increase flights with more at weekends and other changes. This is prior to FAL submitting a formal planning Application to Rushmoor District Council later this year (according to the FAL schedule).

The Council is responding to the details that are published on FAL's consultation website: <https://farnboroughairport2040.com/>

The Council has considerable concerns about the possible impacts of such changes and the following Motion agreed by the Council on 28 September frames the Council's response to FAL's consultation.

1. The Motion

Hart District Council is dismayed that Farnborough Airport Ltd (FAL) should seek to increase their overall flight number cap, as the impact of this will only exacerbate the Climate Change Emergency declared by Hart District Council, Rushmoor Borough Council and the UK government. Hart District Council also recognises that many residents of Hart and surrounding areas will adversely suffer increased noise annoyance from extending the number and operational window of weekend and bank holiday flights. The Chief Executive (in conjunction with Hart's Farnborough Airport Consultative Committee Members) shall submit a more detailed set of comments to the FAL consultation to reflect these views.

Proposed by: Cllrs: Dorn and Radley

2. Detailed Response

The Council's detailed response is:

1. Hart is concerned that public consultation events were not more proportionally focussed at locations in the more affected areas to the west of the main runway (eg. Church Crookham, Crondall, etc)
2. Hart would wish to see all negative impactors (greenhouse gases, noise etc) be at reduced in the future, in terms of their total output attributed to FAL operations, even with increased movements.
3. Pursuant to its climate change agenda, Hart is generally against more flights of any type that increases the release of greenhouse gases. Any proposal to modify flight movements at FRN should be at least carbon-neutral and ideally net-zero (though reduced movements, technological improvements etc) before 2040.
4. Carbon emission improvements must be genuine at source and not be achieved through offsetting.
5. Diplomatic & so called "VIP flights" should no-longer be categorised separately and should be included in the overall annual cap and included in noise contour calculations.

Hart District Council's Response to Farnborough Airport Consultation

This is because they have the same impact on residents and generate the same revenue for the airport operator as 'normal' flights.

6. Hart notes that:
 - a. The increase in flights would set-back FAL's carbon neutrality plans.
 - b. The focus on "controllable" emissions should also look to manage and reduce those aspects that are less controllable including: routing for minimal carbon generation and a proportion of Scope 3 (down route) carbon effects to be factored into the airport's calculations (least the airport becomes a clean gateway for highly polluting activities).
 - c. Hart encourages more rapid progress towards more sustainable aviation in terms of fuel types, aircraft use, routing, and ground-side activities.
7. Hart is concerned about the negative effects on residents from aircraft noise. Any increase in flights will have a disproportionate effect on those closest to the current flight paths. Hence the overall noise effects must be shown to be neutral or reduced in the plan period.
8. Hart opposes any shift in flight numbers towards "non weekdays".
 - a. If changed, the flight numbers must be monitored and controlled to a finer timescale (ie limits per hour) to avoid massive flight concentrations around particular times. The "late on Sunday" slot being an obvious candidate for many of such movements which would cause intolerable over-flight burdens to affected residents during their weekends.
9. The extension of operating hours is not supported. Hart residents suffer enough from the current operating times, with the flight routes over areas inhabited by young families.
10. Hart would prefer a change to licence conditions based on noise and emissions, rather than weight.
11. Hart strongly opposes the change in operating weight limitations from 50->55T, due to existing heavy aircraft (in that weight interval) not being counted and managed in any revised movement limitations.
12. Hart welcomes addition apprenticeship and training opportunities for local young people and believes that the selection process should reflect and reward local connections. Increased opportunities should be included in the conditions of the final proposal.
13. Community Environmental Fund¹ (CEF)

¹ [Apply for a Farnborough Airport Community Environmental Fund grant - Rushmoor Borough Council](#)

Hart District Council's Response to Farnborough Airport Consultation

- a. The contribution² to the Community Environmental Fund for each landing/take-off should be increased to £6 and £12 respectively for the current size categories.
- b. The application area must be changed to better align with those affected by noise. The current 5km circle⁴, should be replaced with a defined area that better aligns with affected residents. An eclipse, aligned with the runway with major axis 18km and minor axis 5km would be a possible option.

14. Hart notes the new Sustainability Fund, but makes the following points: -

- a. The inclusion of such a wide area simply dilutes the application of the fund and makes it less effective. A single fund, more aligned to those areas regularly overflowed would be a better option.
- b. That contributions must be additional to those made for the CEF.
- c. The Criteria for application, method of selection and terms for payments for such a fund (if proposed as additional to the CEF) will need to be clarified. These should be focussed on community groups and be broad enough to enable a eclectic range of projects. Inclusion of local representation in the selection process would be required.

15. Sound Insulation Scheme

- a. Hart requests that the current sound insulation scheme³ terms be clarified and more widely publicised, with a revise definition to assist those residents most affected.⁴ To this end, the scheme should be extended through lower noise contour.
- b. The proposed changes to the scheme are disingenuous, as the western extension is over unpopulated military training land.

Daryl Phillips
Chief Executive
Hart District Council

² *These values do not appear to have been adjusted since the "2010 Deed" (based on the planning appeal conditions) that covers current operations. [Farnborough airport's planning history - Rushmoor Borough Council](#) ⁴ [Airport community and environment fund area map \(rushmoor.gov.uk\)](#)*

³ *[Environment | Farnborough Airport](#)*

⁴ *[Farnborough Airport – Possible Policy Mechanisms for Controlling Noise v4 \(rushmoor.gov.uk\)](#) Para 4.15 states no residential properties have met the criteria.*