

**ALTON TOWN COUNCIL
FULL COUNCIL – 8TH OCTOBER 2025**

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

ITEM 5: CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

FOR NOTING

Further correspondence on Farnborough Airport has been received from Farnborough Noise Group:

- FNG emails to councils and MPs
- Rushmoor BC reply to FNG
- EIA scoping response (Leigh Day on behalf of FNG)
- FNG response on EIA scoping

From: farnboroughnoise@gmail.com <farnboroughnoise@gmail.com>

Sent: 03 October 2025 19:35

Subject: Farnborough Airport application - legal questions

Dear councils,

Please find attached an email sent this evening to the eight regional MPs regarding the EIA Scope Request being pursued by Farnborough Airport to Rushmoor Borough Council. Farnborough Noise Group has engaged Leigh Day to look at aspects of the approach. Of course RBC may reject the scope of the proposal by the airport and set out a scope that properly considers the significant potential impacts of the airport's proposals. In the absence of that, a number of points should be made.

If you have any questions, please pass them back and we will endeavour to answer them.

Regards,

Farnborough Noise Group.

From: farnboroughnoise@gmail.com <farnboroughnoise@gmail.com>

Sent: 03 October 2025 19:22

Subject: Farnborough Airport application - legal questions

Dear Honourable Members of Parliament,

Farnborough Noise Group has engaged Leigh Day to write to Rushmoor Borough Council because we have concerns regarding the way the Environmental Impact Assessment scope request is being pursued:

1. *There are questions regarding the legality of the EIA Scope Request vs the planning application (aka Salami Slicing).*

2. *It is apparent that RBC does not intend to consider public views in reaching its opinion (see attachment).*
3. *RBC intends to make a decision by 15th October which is not sufficient time to engage statutory as well as non-statutory stakeholders. The airport's public consultation webinars are on 9th and 15th October.*
4. *The Environment Agency formally made "no comment" but allocated the application to a very junior person (two-years out of university and no aviation experience). We would not regard this as sufficient engagement with one of the important Statutory Consultees.*
5. *Farnborough Noise Group will be meeting Tony Juniper (Chair of Natural England) tomorrow.*

Our concern remains that the information provided by the airport and on which RBC will make a decision is at best misleading and has not been properly challenged with facts and evidence. Farnborough Noise Group, in the past six years, has never been afforded the opportunity of discussing these concerns with the airport, RBC or the FACC. Conversely, the airport has an unlimited PR budget and has engaged a corporate PR company (Cavendish Consulting) for a number of years.

There is a risk that RBC, with what is currently before it, makes a decision that opens itself up to significant legal challenge and public expenditure. We request that MPs help to represent the concerns of their constituents, whether they are for or against. It would clearly undermine public confidence in such a process if it were to be manipulated.

Best regards,

Farnborough Noise Group.

**RE: Objection Planning Ref.
25/00483/SCOPE | REQUEST
FOR EIA SCOPING OPINION: For
amendments to Conditions 2, 6,
7 and 8 of permission ref.
20/00871/REVPP**

Dear

Thank you for your e-mail.

This specific application does not require residents to be consulted, as it is not an application for planning permission. Accordingly, there is no deadline for the submission of responses from members of the public. It is expected that a response to the applicant's formal request for a scoping opinion will be issued by 15th October.

Further information on the EIA scoping process can be found here: [Farnborough Airport - Environmental Impact Assessment \(EIA\) scoping request - Rushmoor Borough Council](#)

Kind regards,

Service Manager – Development Management
Rushmoor Borough Council | Council Offices |

Rushmoor Borough Council

By email:

plan@rushmoor.gov.uk

tim.mills@rushmoor.gov.uk

EMAIL: rgama@leighday.co.uk

TELEPHONE: 020 7650 1200

YOUR REF: 25/00483/SCOPE

OUR REF: RGA/01473656/1

DATED: 3 October 2025

Dear Rushmoor Borough Council

Request for EIA scoping opinion for proposal to relax operating restrictions at Farnborough Airport (reference 25/00483/SCOPE)

1. We act for Farnborough Noise Group ("**FNG**"), who have instructed us to write to you with representations on the request by Farnborough Airport Limited ("**FAL**") for an environmental impact assessment ("**EIA**") scoping opinion in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 ("**EIA Regulations**").
2. The request relates to a proposal by FAL to increase non-weekday (i.e. weekends and public holiday) aircraft movements at Farnborough Airport within its current limit of 50,000 aircraft movements per annum, amend the maximum take-off weight categories, and amend the conditions related to the airport public safety zone. We will refer to these proposals as the "**Interim Proposals**". That is because they are a less extensive set of the deregulatory proposals which FAL has separately applied for planning permission for under reference 23/00794/REVPP, which we will refer to as the "**Major Proposals**".
3. FAL has provided the following summary comparison of the Interim Proposals against the Major Proposals:

	Existing Limits	New Consultation	Original Consultation
Total annual flights	50,000	50,000	70,000
Total annual non-weekday flights	8,900	13,500	18,900
Restricted weight category	50-80 tonnes	55-80 tonnes*	55-80 tonnes
Non-weekday flights within restricted weight category	270	405	570
Non-weekday hours	08:00-20:00	08:00-20:00	07:00-21:00
<i>*The change from 50 to 55 tonnes would only apply to aircraft which are able to satisfy the most stringent noise standards, aircraft over 50 tonnes which are not able to satisfy the most stringent noise standards will continue to fall with the Airport's restricted weight quotas.</i>			

4. FNG is concerned that the scope of FAL's proposed EIA environmental statement does not fully address the likely significant effects of the Interim Proposals and would therefore fail to comply with the EIA Regulations.

"Salami slicing"

5. It is well-established that it is impermissible when assessing the likely significant effects of a project for the purposes of EIA to exclude the effects of a larger project of which it forms part. See most recently the judgment of Andrews LJ in *R (Ashchurch Rural Parish Council) v Tewksbury Borough Council* [2023] EWCA Civ 101 at [78]:

*"The identity of the "project" for these purposes is not necessarily circumscribed by the ambit of the specific application for planning permission which is under consideration. The objectives of the Directive and the Regulations cannot be circumvented (deliberately or otherwise) by dividing what is in reality a single project into separate parts and treating each of them as a "project" – a process referred to in shorthand as "salami-slicing": see e.g. the observations of the CJEU in *Ecologistas en Accion-CODA v Ayuntamiento de Madrid* [2008] ECR I-6097 at [48] (adopting the approach taken in para [51] of the Advocate-General's opinion)."*

6. Lang J set out a non-exhaustive list of factors which may be taken into account in determining whether two projects should be treated as part of the same project for EIA purposes in *R (Wingfield) v Canterbury City Council* [2019] EWHC 1975 (Admin) at [64]:

"Relevant factors may include:

- i) Common ownership – where two sites are owned or promoted by the same person, this may indicate that they constitute a single project (Larkfleet at [60]);*
- ii) Simultaneous determinations – where two applications are considered and determined by the same committee on the same day and subject to reports which cross refer to one another, this may indicate that they constitute a single project (Burridge at [41] and [79]);*

- iii) Functional interdependence – where one part of a development could not function without another, this may indicate that they constitute a single project (Burridge at [32], [42] and [78]);*
- iv) Stand-alone projects – where a development is justified on its own merits and would be pursued independently of another development, this may indicate that it constitutes a single individual project that is not an integral part of a more substantial scheme (Bowen-West at [24 – 25]).”*
7. In this case, the Interim Proposals are simply a smaller subset of the Major Proposals. By granting planning permission for the Interim Proposals, the council would be permitting part of the Major Proposals. FAL’s proposed approach to the carrying out of EIA for the Interim Proposals would result in an incremental approach to EIA, where the council’s members would only have environmental information about part of the project which FAL carries out, even though it is clear that a more significant project, i.e. that comprised in the Major Proposals, is intended. When it comes to determining the application for the Major Proposals, the baseline for assessment would become the project comprised in the Interim Proposals, meaning that the effects of the Major Proposals will be less significant than they otherwise would have been had an EIA been carried out for the proposals as a whole.
8. That is a classic case of “salami slicing”, where a developer makes piecemeal applications which (whether intended or not) would prevent a comprehensive assessment of the project as a whole. Unless the environmental statement for the Interim Proposals sets out the likely significant effects of the full project proposed by the Major Proposals, the council’s members will be prevented from fully assessing the impacts of the Major Proposals against the baseline of the current operations of the airport.
9. For that reason, the council’s scoping opinion should make clear that the environmental statement for the Interim Proposals contains information on the likely significant effects of the Major Proposals. That should not be overly onerous, given that an environmental statement has already been produced for the Major Proposals (without prejudice to our client’s position as regards the adequacy of the environmental statement for the Major Proposals).

Specific comments on proposed scope of EIA

10. In terms of the detail of what is proposed to be included in the environmental statement, our clients are concerned about the following aspects of the proposed scope of the environmental statement:
- a. In some cases, likely significant effects are scoped out from assessment on the basis that the Interim Proposals do not increase the overall air traffic movement cap of 50,000. For example, odour impacts from the changes to emissions from aircraft movements and supporting onsite infrastructure are proposed to be scoped out because there is no change to the 50,000 cap (Table 6.4, page 62). That is not an appropriate basis to scope out an effect. At present, the airport is not able to reach the 50,000 cap. If as a matter of fact the Interim Proposals are likely to lead to a significant effect because they will result in more aircraft movements in a year and at particular times of the week and year, then that effect must be assessed, even if the overall cap is being increased.

- b. The scoping request proposes that noise impacts will be measured using the L_{Aeq} metric. It is inappropriate only to use this metric, as it fails to capture the impacts of the periodic nature of flight take-offs and landings. Other metrics, such as L_{max} , should also be used in order fully to capture the noise impacts of the Interim Proposals.
- c. The scoping request proposes to use modelled noise averaged over time periods in areas close to the airport. This is not representative of aircraft noise disruption. Places like Tilford, which is 6.5 miles from the airport, is proposed to be scoped out, even though it is below the airport's flightpaths and experiences on average 300 aircraft movements a day. From actual data collected, there are on average 20 to 100 aircraft a day flying over Tilford, producing more than 60dBA per plane. The number, frequency and maximum level of noise events above a level (e.g. 51 dBA – the onset of Lowest Observable noise disruption) should be collected as well as average noise.
- d. The most complained-about aircraft operating from the airport (the Bombardier Challenger 350) produces a very high-pitched whine at all stages of flight. It is one of the most common aircraft making use of the airport, and that use is likely to intensify because the airport is now a Bombardier service centre. Information on noise pitch should therefore be included in the environmental statement.
- e. The scoping request proposes to scope out non-CO₂ warming effects because the *“Jet Zero Strategy will keep non-carbon warming effects under review”* and there is no *“policy requirement to consider noncarbon warming at present”*. That is a misunderstanding of the EIA Regulations. Irrespective of government policy on non-CO₂ warming effects (which in any event is silent on how such effects should be weighed in the planning balance), if such effects are caused by a development, as they are here, then they must be addressed in the environmental statement. Government policy cannot (and has not in any event sought to) exempt from assessment something which by law is required to be assessed in accordance with the EIA Regulations.
- f. It is unclear how the distance thresholds for ecological receptors have been determined. The scoping request suggests that impacts on any European sites within a 10km radius will be assessed and any nationally designated sites within a 2km radius. This fails to assess the impacts on other ecological receptors which may be affected. For example, the Wealden Heaths national nature reserve, which is under the flightpath for the airport, is not listed in the scoping request.
- g. The distance thresholds for population and health receptors are similarly too low, covering some areas of just Rushmoor and Hart. For example, areas more than 10 miles from the airport are known to experience significant noise levels largely caused by aircraft.
- h. The scoping request does not consider the impact on the tranquillity of nearby national landscapes, such as the Surrey Hills National Landscape. That is surprising given that the scoping request acknowledges that the landscapes around the airport have a limited sense of tranquillity because they are beneath the flightpath of the airport (see for example paragraph 12.7.3). The applicant suggests that, because the proposal does not seek to increase the total number of permitted aircraft movement, there would be no impact on tranquillity. However, as said above, given that the Interim Proposals would as a matter of fact mean that there were more aircraft movements than currently, that is bound to impact tranquillity, particular given that there

will be more aircraft movements at weekends and public holidays when people are more likely to seek the tranquillity of a national landscape.

Conclusion

11. We would be grateful if you could take these representations into account in your consideration of the scoping request. We look forward to reviewing the council's scoping opinion alongside FNG in due course.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Leigh Day". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Leigh Day

Farnborough Airport's Environmental Impact Assessment and why it is important.

Key points from the Airport's submission

1. This a large and technical submission by the airport and it needs proper consultation for the public and organisations to be able to respond to it. There are only four weeks from today to respond.
2. The geographic area covered by the assessment is tiny – just a few miles from the airport, but the airport and its flightpaths impact people and other councils up to 15 miles away.
3. The data submitted, such as the airport's emissions have not been scrutinised and are considerably different to data Farnborough Noise Group has.
4. Most councils, including Rushmoor, have declared a climate emergency and have local planning policies to reduce emissions (e.g. introducing electric busses, promoting cycling & walking). Private jets are the most polluting form of transport by far, and any increase in private jets completely undermines the efforts of councils and the public to reduce their emissions.
5. The airport only has a licence to operate business flights. Most flights, particularly weekend flights, are for leisure. This is a time when the airport's operations most impact people as they enjoy their gardens and outdoor spaces.
6. Areas like the newly created Wealden Heaths National Nature Reserve are excluded from scope, despite Farnborough's flightpaths passing over this area.

What is an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)?

An EIA is the process of determining the environmental impact of a planning proposal (See Appendix 1 for more information). It must cover the total impact in any and all areas, not just immediate or local ones. As an example, the Supreme Court determined in 2024 that the total emissions from oil drilling, including when oil is burned, must be considered in an EIA, not just the emissions from drilling itself (<https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2022-0064>). This means that for Farnborough Airport, the total emissions of any proposed increase in flights must be included, not just emissions on the ground or in UK airspace. The impact of an increase in flights on all communities must be considered, not just those close to the airport.

The airport is asking Rushmoor Borough Council what it should include in the Environmental Statement it will submit with its expansion planning application. If RBC requires only a limited scope (such as just measuring noise 3 miles from the airport), that is what they will provide and the Planning Application will be determined on this basis. The EIA is therefore a critical step in the planning process and is a time when people, bodies and councils, who will be impacted by a proposal, should provide input.

Farnborough Airport is intending to complete the EIA Scope stage in the next four weeks (a statutory timeframe of five weeks that started a week ago) and then submit a full planning application in Autumn. This is not sufficient time for adequate public consultation.

Important points referencing Farnborough Airport's submitted document

The document submitted by the airport is here <https://publicaccess.rushmoor.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=T2D594NM0HX00>.

The Proposal refers to "*business aviation growth*" at the airport (e.g. Sect 2.1.1, 3.4.7). The airport only has a licence to operate business (not leisure) flights. However, it is well known that the majority of flights are for leisure purposes (there is research and data to show this). Most leisure flights, as opposed to business flights, are at weekends.

The Environmental Context (Sect 2.1.3) does not recognise National Landscapes and the newly expanded Wealden Heaths National Nature Reserve that is under Farnborough Airport's flightpaths. Human health is only considered up to 6.2 miles from the airport and ecologically important sites 6.2 miles (national sites) or 3.2 miles (local sites) (Sect 6.2.4.).

The Proposal (Sect 2.2.2) suggests the need to operate larger aircraft. On average there are currently 2.5 passengers per plane and 40% fly empty. The increase in aircraft size and weight is not driven by an increase in the number of passengers flown but by the luxury that passengers now expect on private jets and the increase in distances they are flying. Operating larger aircraft has no positive impact on claimed economic benefits from passengers that allegedly generate wealth and growth to the UK.

The Proposal (Sect 3.4) only considers Rushmoor Borough Council's local planning policies. It does not consider the planning policies of other councils impacted by Farnborough Airport's operations and its proposed expansion.

The EIA is required to include the impact on people and environments that could be significantly impacted by the Proposal (Sect 4.1.2). The Proposal does not provide this as it excludes many people and areas that will be significantly impacted.

A baseline is required to assess potential impacts (Sect 4.3.1). This was a requirement on the airport following the Airspace Change and subsequent Post Implementation Review. However, there was no baseline measured. It was only modelled, despite the CEO of the CAA committing to MPs at the time that all aircraft noise would be measured. Had it been carried out, it could have been used as a noise baseline for the EIA. Nor has there been sufficient baseline measurement of pollution (e.g. no measurement of ultrafine particle pollution) and current NOx pollution levels frequently exceed current World Health Organisation "safe levels".

Sections 5.3 and 5.4 (Economic Impact) are not relevant at this stage and they quote misleading information from historic reports (e.g. York Aviation, Lichfields). These reports have not been formally scrutinised e.g. they quote 1,780 people employed at the airport (Farnborough Airport Ltd employs 190 people from statutory accounts, and most of these are cleaning, catering and security) and significant GVA which cannot be substantiated. Furthermore, many of the businesses quoted as contributing to GVA actually make a loss and pay minimal or no corporation tax. A detailed analysis of these reports is available and has been circulated previously by FNG.

There are glaring inconsistencies between local policies and the Proposal. For example, RBC's Transport Policy IN2 seeks to "*minimise the need to travel*", "*promote sustainable transport modes*" and "*enhance pedestrian and cycle networks*". All this would be undermined (by orders of magnitude) if the most polluting form of transport (private jets) were to increase. Furthermore, most passengers, as stated in the airport's Proposal, are travelling from London by executive car, importing high emissions travel.

The Proposal has excluded the impact of odour (e.g kerosine/exhaust fumes) from scope (Table 6.4) because the doubling of flights at weekends would be within the current 50,000 movements cap. However, residents frequently complain about odour from the airport and a doubling of flights at weekends will increase these issues at times when local residents should reasonably expect to enjoy their gardens and the wider outdoors. Odour should be included in scope.

Important legislation is not included in scope regarding noise. The Air Navigation Guidance 2017 seeks to protect people and sites (such as National Landscapes) from aircraft noise.

The Proposal is only considering noise generated by Farnborough aircraft but people and wildlife are impacted by total noise. Areas up to 15 miles from the airport experience Significant Noise (SOAEL) where aviation and Farnborough flights are a major contributor. The scope cannot be restricted to just areas a couple of miles from the airport, nor just the noise created by Farnborough aircraft.

Aircraft vibration noise has been excluded from scope (Table 7.2) because there will be no larger aircraft – but the application includes a significant increase in the weight of aircraft operating.

The study is proposing to use measurements of average noise, for just Farnborough aircraft, over 16 hours – Laeq16 (Sect 7.5.3) but this is misrepresentative, especially at weekends, as the airport operates for 12 hours so noise is averaged out over 4 hours when the airport is not operating (point 7.5.17 is noted). All noise must be measured as people do not separate out noise sources when they are disturbed.

The Proposal seeks to use modelled noise averaged over time periods in areas close to the airport. This is not representative of aircraft noise disruption. Places like Tilford, which is 6.5 miles from the airport, is out of scope but it is under Farnborough's flightpaths and experiences on average 300 aircraft movements a day causing Significant Noise (SOAEL). From actual data collected, there are on average 20 – 100 aircraft a day flying over Tilford producing more than 60dBA per plane. The number, frequency and maximum level of noise events above a level (e.g. 51 dBA – the onset of Lowest Observable noise disruption) should be collected as well as average noise¹.

The most complained about aircraft operating from the airport (Bombardier Challenger 350) produces a very high-pitched whine at all stages of flight. It is one of the most common aircraft operated and increasing in number, because the airport is now a Bombardier Service Centre. Noise pitch should be included in the modelling or the aircraft should be banned.

Noise is going to be modelled based on flightpaths, just as it was for Farnborough Airport's airspace change proposal in 2014 – 2020. But the majority of aircraft do not follow the designated flightpaths or heights so modelling will be misrepresentative. Actual measurement is needed.

The emissions from Farnborough's flights (Scope 3 emissions) are correctly included but the numbers in the document are much lower than our modelling (Sect 8.4.2). We estimate the

¹ FNG has been recording total noise and noise events at Tilford for the past six months. Data is available on EANS

emissions to be 290 – 380 ktCO₂e vs 105 ktCO₂e suggested by the airport. The methodology and calculations we have used are available.

While government policies do not currently include the impact of non-CO₂ effects on climate change (NO_x, contrails, etc) they will be before long. As legislation catches up with research, non-CO₂ impacts should be in scope (Table 8.2). The government is producing a “Carbon Budget Delivery Plan” in autumn. This is expected to clarify some of the contradictory legislation regarding emissions. For example, responsibility for aircraft emissions is being bounced between national and local planning bodies and must be clarified.

Private jets are the highest emission form of travel (20 – 40 times that of commercial air travel which is 3 - 5 times that of car travel per passenger mile). Almost all local authorities have detailed plans and programmes to reduce controllable emissions. It makes no sense for any local authority to increase the most polluting form of travel as it completely wipes out all of the reductions made elsewhere.

The area assessed for environmental impact in the proposed expansion is unrealistic. The area in-scope is typically just 1.6 miles from the airport (Sect 10.2.2, 10.2.5). The impact of the airport and associated flights goes far beyond this – up to 12 miles from the airport. The physical areas included in scope are a mosaic of conjoined habitats and these are mapped in programmes such as the Heathland Connections Programme that includes Farnborough and surrounding heathlands. Harming wildlife in one area has a knock-on effect in others. Also, the impact of aviation growth is not linear. For example, aircraft noise makes it difficult for mating birds to find each other. As noise increases, at some point they just move away. <https://surreyhills.org/heathland-connections/>

The geographic area included in Section 11 (Population and Human Health) is unreasonably small covering some areas of just Rushmoor and Hart. The health impacts caused by noise and pollution impact people in a much greater geography. For example, noise disturbance is known to have an impact on health and mortality (e.g. increase in heart conditions) and areas more than 10 miles from the airport experience significant noise levels (SOAEL) largely caused by aircraft.

Section 11.4 correctly notes that road emissions are the largest contributor to total emissions. But private jet emissions are entirely discretionary and are caused by a tiny number of people, almost all of whom do not live in the surrounding area.

The scope of people whose health may be impacted is misleading. It suggests that only people near the airport, of low socio-economic status with underlying health conditions may be impacted. This is wrong. Pollution (emissions and noise) does not discriminate by location, age, status, etc. It is down to each individual's susceptibility to causal factors.

The scope of the health assessment does not evaluate the impact on children and their education. There are 47,000 children in schools 3,000ft below Farnborough's flightpaths. There is plenty of research showing that noise impacts learning.

The scope excludes many public facilities important for wellbeing. For example, the impact on physical activity and green spaces is excluded (Sect 11.5.14) yet many areas near the airport are specifically intended to be quiet places for public wellbeing that are already significantly impacted by aircraft noise (e.g. Surrey Hills National Landscape).

The methodology for assessing health impacts is unrealistic. For example, Farnham is significantly impacted by Farnborough Airport as it is directly under all the flightpaths. It has a high proportion of

elderly people but very little deprivation (so scores low on table 11.4). Many people chose to move to Farnham because of the facilities and the peace and quiet of the rural surroundings. In relative terms, it is far more impacted by noise disturbance than areas of Rushmoor or Hart but the modelling would not reflect this.

A perverse logic is being applied in several sections of the Proposal and this can be seen in the section on Waste and Natural Resources (Sect 12.4 – and 8.7.5 for emissions). Most of the waste from the airport is sent for incineration, so it has an environmental impact. Human waste from flights and visitors also has an environmental impact. If the number of weekend flights is increased, the amount of waste will increase. However, the document suggests that this should be excluded from scope because the airport is not applying to increase the number of movements above the 50,000 permitted. The 50,000 movements would not be achieved without weekend flights so the real increase of waste resulting from an increase in weekend flights should be included.

The Proposal has excluded the Landscape and Visual impact from scope (Sect 12.7). The argument is that the area is industrial, not tranquil and no construction will take place. This is a great disservice to the thousands of people who live or visit the rural and tranquil areas 3 – 10 miles from the airport (such as Frensham Ponds, a SSSI) which are blighted by constant aircraft overflying at 1,000 – 3,000ft. The disturbance is greatest when most people are outdoors enjoying the area (weekends and summer) which is the time Farnborough Airport expects the greatest increase in flights.

Recommendations

There must be adequate public consultation and the timescales extended so that the document can be properly evaluated.

The scope needs to be amended to pick up the points called out above. In particular the geographic areas that are impacted by the Proposal should be expanded to properly reflect the potential impact on people and protected sites. This means that local authorities with people and places that are impacted should have a voice.

Farnborough Noise Group
18th September 2025

Appendix 1

The aim of Environmental Impact Assessment² is to protect the environment by ensuring that a local planning authority when deciding whether to grant planning permission for a project, which is likely to have significant effects on the environment, does so in the full knowledge of the likely significant effects, and takes this into account in the decision-making process.

The aim of Environmental Impact Assessment is also to ensure that the public are given **early and effective opportunities to participate in the decision-making procedures**.

Purpose of the Scoping document

Determining the extent of issues to be considered in the assessment and reported in the Environmental Statement. The applicant can ask the local planning authority for its opinion on what information needs to be included (which is called a 'scoping opinion').

² <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/environmental-impact-assessment>