



Goostrey Parish Council

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL ON TUESDAY 14TH DECEMBER 2021 at 7.30PM IN THE VILLAGE HALL LOUNGE

Present: Cllrs Morris (KM)(Chairman), Rathbone (TR)(Vice-Chairman), Beckham (NB), Freeman (AF), Morgan (PM), O'Donoghue (IO'D), Roberts (DR), Ross (CR), Sulej (JS) and Williams (EW)

In Attendance: S Jones, Clerk/RFO to the Council and one member of the public

12.21.1. Declaration of Interests: There were no declarations made.

2. Apologies for absence: Apologies for absence were received from Cllr A Kolker (CEC).

3. Minutes: To approve the minutes of the meeting on 23rd November 2021. See the minutes of the meeting at <https://goostreyparishcouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/GPC-Minutes-23112021-Draft-v1-with-appendices-1-1.pdf>

Resolved: *The Parish Council resolves to accept the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting on 23rd November 2021 as a true record of the meeting.*

4. Cheshire East Council Matters: To receive a report on Cheshire East Council Matters. To deal with any questions by Members relating to the report and any questions by Members notified in advance to the Chairman and the CE Councillor. This item was deferred as Cllr Kolker was not in attendance.

5. Committee Matters: To receive reports from the Parish Council Committees:

i. VHMC Meeting on 7th December 2021– Cllr Beckham made a report from the meeting. See minutes at <https://goostreyparishcouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/VHMC-Meeting-07122021-Minutes-Draft-v1-with-appendices.pdf>

Resolved: *The Parish Council resolved to accept the minutes of the VHMC Meeting on 7th December and approve all the resolutions and actions therein.*

6. Planning Matters:

i. To receive consider the following planning applications:

- **21/5950C** – Bromley Cottage, 134 Main Road – Dropped Kerb. Comments due by 16th December 2021. Application can be viewed at <http://planning.cheshireeast.gov.uk/applicationdetails.aspx?pr=21/5950C>

Resolved: The Parish Council resolved to send the following comments regarding this application:

The Parish Council requests that the following Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidance on fences and gates is followed (page 136 of the NP):

"Solid boundary fences, walls and gates in the highway frontage of dwellings shall not exceed 1.0m in height and it is recommended that the planting of hedges, on the dwelling side of the boundary, are maintained to a height not exceeding 2m. Gates must be set back from the carriageway by at least 5m to allow a vehicle to stop off the road prior to access."

This is to avoid the creation of a closed-in feeling along the village's Main Road.

- ii. **Holly Bank Farmhouse and Barn: Invitation to comment on the Consultation Report from Historic England** – To consider submitting the draft report on **page A1**.
Resolved: The Parish Council resolved to submit the report as laid out on page A1.
 - iii. **Cheshire East Local Plan - Draft Jodrell Bank Observatory Supplementary Planning Document Consultation** - To consider the councils response to the consultation. See report on **page A1-A2**.
Resolved: The Parish Council resolved to submit the response, as laid out on pages 5 & 6 with the agreed amendment to the final paragraph.
- 7. Financial Payments:** To approve payments in Schedule 12/21. **Includes:** Salaries & expenses see Payment Schedule on **page A2**.
Resolved: The Parish Council resolved to approve the payments listed on Schedule 12/21.
- 8. Clerk’s Report** – including Actions from the Last Meeting and Correspondence. See report on **page A3**.
Resolved: The Parish Council resolved to send a letter to the resident regarding their enquiry (item o)). The response should say that the Parish Council does not have any issues with the trees being removed.
Action: Clerk to contact the “Goostrey Shed” project co-ordinator to arrange a visit for PM, IO’D and CR.
The Clerk reported that Cheshire Community Action are still offering free Safeguarding Training if councillors would like to attend, they should contact the Clerk.
- 9. Highways & Speedwatch**
- i. **Speedwatch Report** – To receive the Speedwatch Report – TR (see report on **page A4**)
 - **SDU at Shearbrook, Main Road - Summary Report November 2021** – See report on **page A4**.
 - ii. **Highways Speed Management Strategy Consultation** - To consider submitting the draft response on **page A5 – A6**.
Additional comments were received regarding the 20mph speed limit near the school, the potential loss of SDU’s which have been purchased by councils at great expense with no data to support their removal. **Action:** KM and TR to update the draft report with these additional comments.
Resolved: The Parish Council resolved to submit the draft response to the Highways Speed Management Strategy Consultation with the inclusion of the additional comments from Councillors received at the meeting.
Action: Clerk to put a notice on the website to allow residents the opportunity to send in their own comments on the consultation.
- 10. Police Matters** – To consider any matters related to local policing – TR had nothing to report, however, IO’D reported that two police officers had entered the Trading Post not wearing face coverings and when challenged they still refused to wear them. **Action:** Clerk to ask PCSO for new dates for Police Surgeries.
- 11. ChALC** – To review any response from ChALC to the Council’s Letter – KM
KM asked for comments on the response from ChALC. PM and AF commented that the letter the council sent did not include the question of value for money from the advice received from ChALC and why there were no reports at the ChALC Annual Meeting regarding motions passed the previous year and that the opportunity to ask these questions seems to have been missed as the letter focussed on the “Handforth” incident. PM further commented

that the response received from ChALC to the Council's letter is what we would have expected to receive. KM commented that the response was disappointing and didn't respond to the specific examples that were raised. .

Action: Clerk to find out if we would still receive communications from NALC and to provide a comparison of similar services. Clerk to ensure there is an item regarding whether or not to continue with ChALC membership on the agenda of the February PC meeting.

- 12. Review of Council Documentation Archives** – To consider a proposal for the review of Planning Applications prior to 2009 and general correspondence (see report on **page A7**)

Resolved: *The Parish Council resolved to allow the Archive Group access to the historic archive files via the Clerk for their assessment and evaluation for value to the Archive.*

Action: Clerk to send National Archive advice on GDPR and archives to the Archive Group.

- 13. LCAS Quality Gold Application** – To receive a report from the Clerk regarding the plan to submit the application by 28th January 2022. See report on **page A7**.

Action: Clerk to circulate the application form for councillors for their input to the activities the council has undertaken which support the statements on the form.

- 14. Manchester Airport Future Airspace Stakeholder Engagement session 7th December 2021** – To receive a report from the meeting DR (see report on **page A8-A9**). DR commented that the changes to the flight corridors pass over Goostrey and Jodrell Bank. The next stage would be for the flight paths to be defined and is likely to take place in April 2022.

- 15. Minor items and items for the next agenda**

i. **Postal Service in Goostrey** – DR reported that there had been significant delays in the post in Goostrey and the surrounding areas. CEC has written to the Royal Mail Chief Executive Officer and CEC has reported that the whole of CW4 postal area has been affected. **Action:** Clerk to ask Cllr Kolker to report back to the Council.

ii. **Extraordinary Meetings of the Parish Council** – KM reported that since the last PC meeting there has been an increased risk of infection from Omicron, and the advice from NALC is that Councils should not meet. If the PC is to meet informally by Zoom then a scheme of delegation to the Clerk would need to be approved by the Council. KM proposed that an Extraordinary Meeting is scheduled with the Scheme of Delegation to the Clerk as the main item. It may be necessary to hold a zoom meeting to discuss the LCAS Gold Award and then a further Extraordinary Meeting.

Resolved: *The Parish Council resolved to hold an Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council on 6th January 2022.*

iii. **Newsletter** - The Clerk requested items for the Newsletter by 4th January 2022.

- 16. Date of Next Meeting – Tuesday 25th January 2021**

Resolved: *The Parish Council resolved to move to Part Two to discuss confidential items relating to staff payments and benefits.*

PART TWO

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC ARE ASKED TO RETIRE.

In accordance with the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, as extended by the Local Government Act of 1972, the press and public are excluded from the meeting for the discussion of the undermentioned items on the grounds that the publication of the matters would be prejudicial to public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.

17. Staff Matters

- i. **To consider the New Clerk's Pension Scheme and Employer Contributions** - This item will be deferred to the Finance Meeting on 18th January 2021.
- ii. **To consider an increase for the Village Supervisors following the completion of their six-month probationary period.**

The Dukes have successfully completed their 6 month probationary period of employment as Village Hall Supervisors, and it is recommended that they be offered a pay rise. The details of the increase are listed in the confidential report from the Parish Council Meeting on 14th December 2021.

Resolved: *The Parish Council resolves to approve the increase in the Village Hall Supervisors (the details of the increase are contained in the confidential report).*

Action: Clerk to send letters Chris and Yvonne Duke to confirm their successful completion of the 6-month probationary period and their pay increase.

18. Close Meeting

APPENDIX

ITEM 12.21.06 – PLANNING MATTERS –

- ii. **Holly Bank Farmhouse and Barn: Invitation to comment on Consultation Report** – To consider submitting the draft response below.

The background is that the Cheshire East’s Heritage Officer has carried out a review of the Planning Application to demolish Holly Bank Farm and Barns at 65/67 Main Road and they have concluded that, from inspection of the buildings, the barn should be treated as a ‘Non-Designated Heritage Asset’ for which there is ‘a presumption in policy for its retention’ and the Heritage Officer states that ‘There is no justification for its demolition’ (the full report is attached as a separate document).

Subsequent to this, Historic England have also carried out a full review of the Farmhouse and Barns – their report can be accessed from the link below. Their process is that they gather all the facts first (as per their document), then consult with interested parties (current stage) and only after that do they make a decision on listing. They conclude that both the Farmhouse and Barn date back to the C18.

The Archive Group has a photo from early 20th Century and maps but these don’t add any new information.

It is suggested that the Council respond to English Heritage as follows:

1. The Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan (GNP) lists Holly Bank Farm as a ‘Local Heritage Asset’, defined as having ‘a connection to the social and economic history of Goostrey Parish’ (Section 6.3).
2. GNP Policy OCEH3 seeks to preserve Heritage Assets including Holly Bank. A formal listing by English Heritage would give this policy substantially more weight.
3. As pointed out by both Cheshire East and English Heritage the assets are visible to residents and visitors passing by on Main Road.
4. We do not have any other historical evidence that we can provide, but are happy to accept the reports of CE and EH experts.

- iii. **Cheshire East Local Plan - Draft Jodrell Bank Observatory Supplementary Planning Document Consultation** - To consider the councils response to the consultation below.

‘The Lovell Telescope, the Control Room and the SKA world headquarters are all situated within Goostrey Parish. The Parish Council strongly supports the protection of the Jodrell Bank Observatory’s world leading research as well as its status as a UNESCO World Heritage Site of Outstanding Universal Value. The following sections of the Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan specifically apply to JBO:

‘Science: Objective: Support the economic, educational and scientific capabilities of Jodrell Bank Observatory.

Policy SC1: Policy SC1. SCIENCE FACILITIES

The development and expansion of the buildings for scientific research and associated education and exhibition facilities at JBO will generally be supported. This includes the ‘First Light’ Project, the restoration and enhancement of the Sir Bernard Lovell Telescope, extension of the original control buildings and the construction of the world headquarters for the SKA project.

Policy SC2: Policy SC2. IMPAIRMENT OF OPERATIONS AT JBO

Developments will not be permitted which can be shown to impair the efficient operation of the radio telescopes.'

The Neighbourhood Plan 'Policy OCEH3 Heritage' also supports the enhancement and conservation of heritage assets and their settings in Goostrey Parish.

On a more detailed level, we should say that Appendix 3 is missing the map that shows the difference between the 'Inner' and 'Outer' Consultation Zones, this should be added.

Also we recommend clarifying that relevant applications in the JBOCZ should be accompanied by a 'Radio Interference Assessment' (as noted in SPD Section 6.15) which will require consultation with the University of Manchester (Section 6.16), **regardless of whether they are in the Inner or Outer Consultation Zone**. Appendix 3 lists some exceptions on consultation for the Outer Zone, but without the assessment and consultation on these exceptions it will not be possible to determine if CE Local Plan Policy SE14 is met or not.

ITEM 12.21.08 – CLERK’S REPORT**Actions from the Last Meeting**

- a. Chairman to write a letter for the Clerk to send to the President of ChALC about the Council’s concerns following the “Handforth” incident.
- b. Clerk to submit the Precept request to Cheshire East.
- c. Clerk to follow up actions from Booth Bed Lane/Main Road/ Hermitage Meeting on 14th September 2021, as listed in the report by CEC Highways.

Correspondence

- a. HistoricEngland - Holly Bank Farmhouse and Barn: Invitation to comment on Consultation Report
- b. Ade Chadwick RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: *** Beat Surgery Cancellation *** Sat 04/12 109 KB
- c. Resident – Open Gardens June 2022
- d. National Association of Local Councils  NALC EVENTS
- e. The Goostrey Shed – Letter of thank for PC Grant Funding
- f. Bennett Brooks RE: Internal Audit for Goostrey Parish Council
- g. URGENT: Manchester Airport Future Airspace Stakeholder Engagement session - Local Authorities / Parish Councils
- h. Cheshire Community Action - Free Safeguarding Training Session
- i. National Association of Local Councils  NALC NEWSLETTER
- j. SLCC SLCC Daily Digest - 08/12/2021
- k. From Subject Received Size Categories
- l. Cheshire East Local Plan - Draft Jodrell Bank Observatory Supplementary Planning Document Consultation
- m. Draft Speed Management Strategy - Public Consultation
- n. CEC [OFFICIAL] RE: Parish Precept Arrangements & Taxbase 2022/23
- o. Resident - Conifer Trees at Brookfield Crescent – To consider sending the draft response below. The residents have submitted a question to the council regarding their plans to remove the conifers from their land and replace them with a fence. As the conifers are not subject to a TPO the Parish Council does not need to comment on their removal, however, there is a question about the type and height of the fence which needs to be reviewed and discussed (see attached document).

The recommendation is to advise the residents that the Council cannot comment on the removal of the trees and there is no TPO on the trees and therefore the Council does not need to be consulted on their removal however, the fence should not be a solid fence and should not be no more than 1 metre in height as it is adjacent to the highway.

ITEM 12.21.09 – HIGHWAYS & SPEEDWATCH

i. **Speedwatch Report** – To receive the Speedwatch Report – TR

GOOSTREY PARISH COUNCIL SPEEDWATCH REPORT 15/11/2021 – 20/11/2021

DATE & TIME	LOCATION	LOW SPEED MPH	TOP SPEED MPH	NUMBER OF VEHICLES LOGGED	TOTAL NUMBER OF VEHICLES PASSING
15/11/2021 08.30- 09.30	MAIN ROAD SHEARBROOK	35	39	3	266
19/11/2021 08.30 – 09.30	MAIN ROAD SHEARBROOK	35	38	7	320
			TOTAL	10	586

Report to Parish Council December 2021

Speedwatch Activity Summary GPC Current Year To-date

Speedwatch sessions resumed On 26th July 2021 having been suspended on 4th November 2020 due Covid 19 issues. Twenty-eight sessions have been held. A total of 6004 vehicles have been monitored with 152 vehicles logged at 35mph and above. The maximum speed monitored is 43 mph.

In this report period 1.7% of the vehicles monitored were travelling at 35mph and above. The comparative figures for 2020 and 2019 were No data and 2.4% respectively.

TR 02/12/2021

- **SDU at Shearbrook, Main Road - Summary Report November 2021**

Main Road Shearbrook SID Summary Data

Month 2021	Total Number of Vehicles	% Travelling at over 35MPH	Highest Speed and time	Comments
February	20,931	24.1	61.3mph 21.00	Highest previous Speed 88.3mph 02.00 January 2021
March	27,630	23.9	60.3mph 01.00 & 18.00	
April	31,453	26.6	65mph Midnight & 07.00	
May	42,455	27	59 mph 16.00 & 23.00	
June	34,485	26	63.3mph 16.00	
July	34,239	29.5	59mph 13.00, 20.00,22.00, 24.00 & 24.00	
August	35,902	22.1	64mph 13.00	
September	34,981	21.1	67.2mph 19.00	
October	35,369	20.2	60.4mph 17.00	
November	36,340	18.0	60.3mph 22.00	

Note for November Data – Total number of vehicles appears to have stabilised in the region of 35,000 to 36,000 vehicles at about 35,000. Approximately 6,500 vehicles were travelling at 35mph and above in the month which gives an average 217 vehicles per day, which is a marginal reduction from previous months. However, 216 vehicles were travelling in excess of 45 mph at times fairly evenly distributed between 6am and 11pm.

02/12/2021 Report for November 2021 GPC meeting.

- ii. **Highways Speed Management Strategy Consultation** - To consider submitting the draft response below.

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL'S SPEED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY CONSULTATION 2021
GPC RESPONSE TO THE CONULTATION

1. Speeding is the highest priority concern of residents creating continual contacts/complaints.
2. GPC considers that our significant capital investment and on-going revenue expenditure on SIDs, both of which are fully supported by residents, will be undermined if the strategy is implemented as set out in the draft document.
3. The proposed CEC Strategy reads as almost a determination to make it too difficult to do anything, rather than positively find ways of controlling speed, whilst making the somewhat unrealistic assumption that this will somehow lead to more 'Active Travel' (walking and cycling).
4. GPC is relieved that there have only been two 'serious' incidents recorded in the last 5 years. This means that Goostrey is unlikely to achieve sufficient priority for action in any of the measured data led prioritisation sections in the draft document unless the concern of residents is given a high weighting. This does not make sense as there is a high risk for at least one of the cross road junctions caused by lack of visibility in all directions. This is coupled with the fact that almost 80% of traffic through the village exceeds the 30mph speed limit (recorded by SID measurements over a long period of time). Furthermore, Goostrey village has extremely narrow footways, which are in places poorly maintained or disrupted by tree roots which has led to at least one disabled scooter rider being tipped into the road.
5. The Police and Crime Commissioner appears to be listening to the concerns of residents in respect of speeding with his current proposal for a pilot project in villages for installation of Average Speed Cameras with further projects if AVC installation is successful. The PCC considers AVCs to be the only viable way of making a significant impact on reducing speeding. The PCC has requested information from PCs interested in being included in the Pilot Project. GPC has asked to be considered as a candidate for the Pilot and intimated that it may be prepared to fund the whole capital cost of an AVC installation. GPC would be very disappointed if the score from a dubious prioritisation system over-ruled residents desire for effective speed control which they are prepared to consider funding. GPC urges that the draft strategy be amended to support such AVC installations.
6. GPC currently has five fixed SIDs which are working permanently, kept in good repair and with any breakdowns addressed promptly. GPC challenges the general relevance and some of the conclusions, apparently lifted without further assessment by CEC from TRL PPR314 Effectiveness of Speed Indicator Devices on Reducing Speeds in **London**. (emphasis applied) The Kingston-upon-Thames survey area had an average of 7,000 vehicles per day. Goostrey village [not untypical of many CEC areas] has an average of approximately 1,000 vehicles per day. Scale is therefore an issue. The conclusion that SIDs should be moved at intervals not exceeding three weeks is poorly supported in PPR314. It is generally accepted that that SIDs are most effective during the first "novelty" week of installation. However, there were only two sets of data for weeks two and three with one set showing a reduction in effectiveness between weeks two and three and the other dataset showing no change. There is no data presented for any periods beyond week three and there appears to be little evidence to support moving the devices at a period not exceeding three weeks. GPC experience is that from simple observation of vehicles passing a SID many including those travelling within and in excess of the speed limit do slow down when the SID displays and provides a useful illuminated reminder to motorists of the limit. GPC considers this to be both a useful and worthwhile benefit of their permanent SIDs whilst avoiding the general difficulties and expense of frequent movement of devices. It is noted that RBKT recommends the use of mains powered SIDs. GPC would welcome this to improve the reliability of current solar panel and battery systems in Winter. GPC is concerned about the threat of possible confiscation of their equipment and asks that at least this is not made retrospective if the Strategy is implemented.
7. GPC understands that the portable SID equipment is to be provided by the PC and CEC may then provide a Service and Maintenance Regime for installation and removal of the equipment together with the other required maintenance of the SID unit, also CEC intends to charge the PC for all of these services. GPC has made unsuccessful enquiries to CEC to determine the amount of these charges for a single set up and removal. GPC is concerned that these charges may be unaffordable especially if they are based on CEC term contractor rates. Can CEC please consider providing these services to Town and Parish Councils without charging?

Goostrey has some narrow carriageways and particularly narrow footways. This means that there were very limited suitable locations for the seven fixed SID posts currently available. Positioning of portable SIDs will be even more challenging with the need to include chaining to existing posts without introducing new hazards. GPC is concerned that motorists will take less notice of the Portable SIDS than the Post mounted SIDs as the former look less official and may therefore be more inclined to be totally ignored.

8. The consultation supports the use of Speed Watch, GPC does operate such a scheme however GPC also sees this as a sop as no enforcement can come from these sessions.
9. GPC requests CEC to modify the draft Strategy as set out above.

Final 05/12/21

ITEM 12.21.12 – REVIEW OF COUNCIL DOCUMENTATION ARCHIVES – To consider a proposal for the review of Planning Applications prior to 2009 and general correspondence

The Clerk has spoken with the members of the Archive Group and they have agreed to review the Parish Council archive files for planning and general correspondence to see if there is anything of value to be kept in the Archive.

If they are of value they can be redacted if there is personal information present and if not retained for the archive intact.

Any items deemed not of value can be given to the Clerk for disposal according to the document retention policy.

Motion: The Parish Council resolves to allow the Archive Group access to the archived files via the Clerk for their assessment and evaluation for value to the Archive.

ITEM 12.21.13 – LCAS QUALITY GOLD APPLICATION – To receive a report from the Clerk regarding the plan to submit the application by 28th January 2022.

The Clerk recommends that Council uses the approach used by Holmes Chapel Parish Council to achieve Quality Gold Status.

This involves creating a number of statements, and the required project plan which needs to be related to the 3 year financial plan.

The Clerk proposes to carry out most of the work between 17th December 2021 and 10th January 2022. Councillors will be asked to volunteer to help write the statements and with some of the wording of the reports.

Once complete the application must be approved by the council at a full council meeting. Given that the minute references need to be available and published prior to the submission of the application on 28th January 2022, it is proposed that a short extraordinary meeting of the council is held between 10th and 20th January to approve the statements for the submission to be made.

A copy of the full submission made by Holmes Chape Parish Council is attached separately.

ITEM 12.21.14 – MANCHESTER AIRPORT FUTURE AIRSPACE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT SESSION 7TH DECEMBER 2021. Report from Cllr D Roberts.

The consultation is the last session in this phase.

A key point from the meeting - the Future Airspace Consultation team want views from local stakeholders.

Attached please find the following:

- Manchester Airport Future Airspace - background (pre-meeting document)
- Glossary of the various abbreviations.
- PDF of the presentation slides
- Q&A document with commonly asked questions.

The meeting started with a summary of the various flight paths.

One point - 'stack' is where they hold flights if there are backlogs at the airport.

The next part went through the various options

The key point here is Manchester Airport manages flights up to 7000 ft - after that, it transfers to NATS (the UK's provider of air-traffic control)

Route options need to take several things into consideration. Each of the considerations aligns with agreed design principles.

- Some are "must-haves" safety, policy & capacity
- Others provide guidance or an opportunity.
- Others create a constraint

Design Consideration - Aircraft

A detailed survey was performed where operators were asked about current and future aircraft. This was used to define the boundaries where aircraft can exceed 7000ft.

One point - existing departures from Manchester are directed to fly Standard Instrument Departures (SID's). A SID is a series of navigational instructions, laid out with a diagram and text that simplify departure. These are being replaced with satellite navigation systems that are installed on modern aircraft.

Design Envelopes are a "swathe" or wide area of airspace that goes from the runway to 7,000ft above sea level. They are based around current routes where they exist and an option to insert new envelopes which may offer better departures, less noise and improved fuel efficiency..

The constraints slide shows the no-go areas and shows the areas that can be used for departures and arrivals.

The design envelopes shown on the slides are initial options only and are therefore subject to further discussion and amendment. NB the design envelopes are not the routes themselves; they represent the broad areas where routes could be placed. The initial proposals for actual routes will be presented in a further discussion session in spring 2022 following feedback from interested parties on the design envelopes.

My questions:

- 1) Are additional stacks being considered - Not at this stage
- 2) Any impact on Jodrell Bank - NO
- 3) Are additional routes likely - YES if required to address additional demand

Other questions

- 4) Do the changes apply to freight - YES
- 5) Have you consulted with minor airports - YES

Full details of the responses will be made available.

The Future Airspace Consultation team want feedback on the following:

DEPARTURES

- Q1. Taking account of the identified constraints and design considerations, have we identified design envelopes for departures that align with our design principles?
- Q2. Within the design envelopes, are there any local factors we should be aware of when designing routes?
- Q3. If we were to replicate our current routes (do-minimum scenario) how could we improve them?
- Q4. Is there any other feedback on the initial options of envelopes identified?

ARRIVALS?

- Q1. Taking account of the identified constraints and design considerations, have we identified design envelopes for arrivals that align with our design principles?
- Q2. Within the identified areas, are there any local factors we should be aware of when designing options for the position of the arrival route?
- Q3. Is there any other feedback on the initial options of envelopes identified?
- Q4. Are there any comments/feedback on the do-nothing scenario? If we were to replicate our current routes (do-minimum scenario), how could we improve them?

Comment from the Consultation team: Councils are requested to complete the survey by 5 pm, Friday 10th December - There is a risk that comments received after Friday 10th December will be too late for consideration.

The Council's response was submitted on 10th December 2021 by Cllr Roberts and was circulated to all councillors.