



12 September 2012

**Please reply to: 27 OTTERSHAW PARK, OTTERSHAW, CHERTSEY, SURREY, KT6 OQG**  
**Email copy to: neastment@tiscali.co.uk**

Dear Sirs,

**Submission in respect of Fairoaks Airport, Chobham, Surrey GU24 8HU**

I am writing as the Chobham Society's Representative on the Fairoaks Consultative Committee in response to the submission to the Airports Commission by Savills, on behalf of Fairoaks Operations Ltd.

Before responding to the detail of the submission the Commission should be aware that the airport is now in split ownership. We believe Albemarle Fairoaks Ltd, part of Albemarle Investment Syndicate, own the 170 acre airfield. The remaining 40 acre built area, designated as a Major Developed Site within the Green Belt is owned by West Register, an RBS 'toxic asset' company.

The licenced operator, Fairoaks Operations Ltd, is a wholly owned subsidiary of Albemarle Fairoaks Ltd; it has few assets, limited staff and neither it or its predecessor Fairoaks Airport (Operations) Ltd have filed company accounts for the last 3 years.

We are happy to stand corrected on the precise detail of ownership which has been a merry-go-round of ownership, liquidation and change of company name since the sale of Fairoaks Airport by Alan Mann to Erinaceous in 2007.

**It is our opinion that Savills submission is more likely to be an attempt to explore the planning and development potential of the site rather than a serious attempt to resolve the UK's hub airport issue!**

**We would also question Savills depth of knowledge on aviation matters, please see below.**

In specific response to the points in their submission:

- **An extension of the runway is wholly impractical.** It cannot be achieved within the existing licensed airfield. Additional land would have to be purchased from neighbours. This is clearly illustrated in the plan attached to the Savills submission.
- There are no existing terminal building or passenger facilities beyond the flying school and café. It is difficult to see what facility there is for Savills to 'improve'.
- 'Discussions' with the local authority are claimed – but not detailed. My enquiry to SHBC Planning Officials similarly produced no information. **SHBC planning officials informed me they were not aware of any discussion with Savills.**
- The 2003 Aviation White Paper has been discredited and cannot be relied upon as justification by Savills in their submission. - The Department for Transport published its

Scoping Document: *Developing a sustainable framework for UK aviation March 2011*.  
"This document recognises that the 2003 Air Transport White Paper is out of date and no longer fit for purpose." The Parish Councils Airport Association

- To justify their Core Strategy Surrey Heath Borough Council have requested a 'master plan' from the airport, which has not been forthcoming. This submission is merely an attempt to submit a 'wish list' – totally without any business case. A poor substitute for a considered 'master plan'.
- The claimed 'strategic fit' and economic benefit is again totally without justification. It is more an estate agents particulars; there is no serious economic analysis.
- The submission totally ignores the significant local villages of Chobham, Ottershaw and Horsell which are regularly overflowed by aircraft from Fairoaks and will obviously be adversely affected by the massive increase in flights mentioned.
- Fairoaks is close to Chobham Common and Horsell Common, both Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The location of Fairoaks makes it an important wildlife corridor between the two SSSI's. **Savills seem to be totally unaware of the existence of these internationally important sites!** Additionally Fairoaks Airport is within 500 yards of a 'Site of Nature Conservation Importance', which is clearly marked on the map in the Surrey Heath Local Plan, used in the recent 'Site Allocations' discussion between SHBC and Fairoaks.
- Under their section 'People' Savills claim "impacts on people are likely to be positive". Fairoaks has no publicised complaint procedure, no noise abatement plan and consistently fails to consult on operational matters with either its Consultative Committee or otherwise with local residents. Savills clearly know nothing about local conditions and any increase in flying activity will not be seen as positive by local people.
- The submission proposes to implement changes through 'permitted development rights' and states 'many additional aviation related developments can be carried out without the need for planning permission'. It is the Chobham Society's view that GPDO's were not intended to facilitate uncontrolled airport expansion. The commission should consider Surrey Heath Borough Council's 'Decision' on Fairoaks recent permitted development of a 6,000 sq. m. hangar on Green Belt land.

**Decision: RAISE OBJECTION subject to reason(s)**

**Decision Conditions or reasons: The Council considers that the proposal would have an adverse visual impact on the Green Belt amounting to inappropriate development for which "very special circumstances" have not been provided.**

**Insufficient information has been provided to assess any mitigation against noise and disturbance to local residents and as such, the current proposal is likely to have an adverse impact on residential amenity.**

It is clear that Fairoaks Airport do not take proper consideration for the effect of their activities on local communities or the Green Belt.

Additionally:

- There have been several accidents including fatalities over the years, with aircraft crashing in adjacent fields and woodland. There is no consideration for aspects of safety with larger aircraft.
- **Navigational and landing facilities are not in place to support larger aircraft. I am advised that significant investment, up to £10 million, may be required which is not recognised in this submission.**
- There is no detail of any consultation with either Heathrow or Farnborough. Are either likely to welcome additional traffic within or close to their respective control zones?
- There is no business case to support the relocation of business aircraft from Heathrow or Farnborough. **We believe that virtually no business jets operate out of Heathrow, the slots are far too valuable to BA, yet Savills have claim they will free space there!** Also why should business users want to move out of Farnborough,

an airport developed specifically for that traffic and with recently increased flight capacity?

- Neither is there a case to support any growing demand for business flights such as would support the expansion described. Indeed the current economic climate has arguably led to a new 'rationalism' as far as business flights are concerned.
- In discussion with commercial pilots we have been advised:
  - 1) That the rising land to the East of the runway will impact on aircraft performance if the runway is extended towards Ottershaw.
  - 2) That take-off towards Ottershaw will lead to bigger and faster aircraft flying low directly over an area of population.
  - 3) That an increase of runway length from 800 to 1200 meters is a 'step change' and could allow increased aircraft weight by a factor of ten (x10).
  - 4) A longer runway could allow unladen 140 seat jet airliners to land in Fair Oaks for a 'Lasham-style' operation, category D maintenance or aircraft dismantling.
  - 5) Larger aircraft increases loading on the existing runway. The submission contains no reference to PCN (pavement classification number) to establish if larger aircraft can be accommodated.
  - 6) Larger aircraft will be turning further out, in severely constrained airspace over the M25.
- Also since Jan 2010 it has been government policy to have 'indicated public safety zones' before any decisions to expand runways. Clearly no PSZ has been considered.

Recently, Farnborough, in the teeth of local council and residents' opposition had its permitted level of flights raised from 28,000 to 50,000. At Fair Oaks it is inconceivable that the threat of 120,000 annual fixed wing flights and unlimited helicopter flights will not cause significant local noise nuisance and local opposition. This is massively more flights than will be permitted at Farnborough and if combined with any increases at Heathrow will be hugely detrimental to quality of life in Chobham and the surrounding villages.

**The points above clearly illustrate that the Savills submission is poorly thought out and totally unsupported with any evidence that might indicate there was a business case. It is a speculative 'wish list' for property developers with no basis in aviation need or the practicalities involved.**

**Conclusion:**

**The Chobham Society urges the Airports Commission to inform Savills that Fair Oaks Airport should improve in its current role as a general aviation airport; that it should comply with existing DfT Guidelines for Consultation and that Fair Oaks Airport has no role in the short, medium or long term question of airport capacity in the UK.**

Yours sincerely,

Nigel Eastment  
Chobham Society Fair Oaks Representative