



The General Aviation Awareness Council

President: The Lord Rotherwick

April 2015

GENERAL AVIATION SECTOR-LED GUIDANCE ON PLANNING IN RELATION TO AERODROMES FOR LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES, AERODROME OWNERS AND AERODROME OPERATORS.

INTRODUCTION.

This document has been prepared by the General Aviation Awareness Council (GAAC) in response to a Government request for industry-agreed advice to assist decision makers in taking proportionate and appropriate account of the potential contribution of aerodromes both to the national economy and local communities. It also contains advice to aerodrome owners and managers to support them in understanding the protections and limitations of planning processes from their point of view.

The GAAC is a national body supported by over 60 organisations representing all areas of the general and light aviation movement, with a cumulative membership totalling over 40,000 people. It therefore has industry-wide authority to speak on matters related to airfields, take-off and landing sites used by its members.

The UK GA fleet is estimated to exceed 27,000 aircraft. These aircraft are flown by more than 32,000 pilots. When, on 22 March 2013, the Government published its Aviation Policy Framework (APF) it noted:

"The business and general aviation (GA) [sector] is important to the UK. The sector delivers vital services, including search and rescue, mail delivery, life-saving (organ) transport, law enforcement, aerial survey and environmental protection flights, as well as underpinning the training of future pilots, ground-based aircraft engineers and technicians. The sector also covers a wide range of activities, from corporate business jets and commercial helicopter operations through to recreational flying in small private aircraft, including gliders.

Research by York Aviation on the economic contribution of General Aviation was commissioned by the Government and published in March 2015. The research suggests that the total economic footprint of UK based GA activity in 2013 is some £3 billion, supporting over 38,000 jobs, 9,700 directly related to flying and the remainder to manufacturing. In Gross Value Added terms, this total includes;

- an economic footprint from GA flying operations of £1.1 billion;
- the export component of GA manufacturing of around £1.1 billion;
- additional wider benefits deriving from the use of business aviation of at least £0.8 billion.

There are also additional benefits to associated industries such as tourism.

However this research also indicates that while business aviation and air taxis have experienced growth in movements of around 7% since 2005, there has been a significant decline in aero club and private flying in this period. While there are some signs that this market is recovering from the recession, if GA flying operations could be reinvigorated to levels similar to those of 2005 then the economic value of the sector could increase to some £1.8 billion. Local authorities should be aware of these findings and of the contribution that general aviation can make to regional economies.

Maintaining access to a national network of general aviation airfields is vital to the continuing success of the general aviation industry and the provision of a viable nationwide transport infrastructure, as well as providing access to aviation for sport and leisure. It is noteworthy that ninety-six per cent of city pairs served by business aviation have no scheduled connection.

It should also be noted that different aspects of General Aviation operate from different types of aerodromes and airports. For example, at a larger regional airport a business jet may be regarded as a typical GA aircraft and often such regional airports do not encourage light aircraft or flying training. Smaller aerodromes, which cannot handle larger business aircraft, therefore remain equally important not only in terms of regional connectivity, but also in terms of local amenity, because they offer a greater diversity of aviation activity including flying training and access to sport aviation.

There is also a practical need in pilot training for a hierarchical airfield network to enable new pilots to be properly trained in different airfield environments, as well as allowing progressive training from basic to more complex and sophisticated aircraft.

Despite this clear importance, a number of airfields have closed and others have been recently threatened as a result of owners seeking to release the value of their land and local planning authorities giving priority to housing and other development. The General Aviation Challenge Panel Report of May 2014 stated: “... local government and councils (for fiscal and housing delivery reasons) generally do not consider the potential economic value of aviation or unlicensed aerodromes. ...”

It is important to properly assess the role of an aerodrome as part of a strategic network of aerodromes supporting General Aviation as a vital and sustainable part of the country’s business and transportation infrastructure. This guidance document highlights areas of pressure and suggests how planners and aerodrome operators can help protect and develop a strategic network of aerodromes needed to support a potentially vibrant UK GA sector.

(It should be noted that, for the sake of simplicity, the terms airfield, aerodrome and flying site in this document, can be assumed to have the same meaning; flying sites smaller than international or regional airports, that support non-scheduled, general aviation operations.)

SUMMARY OF KEY AREAS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. CONNECTIVITY. THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL GA AIRFIELD INFRASTRUCTURE

(see also detail paragraphs 1-8)

A network of GA aerodromes around the UK, provides vital connectivity for business travellers and acts as an important and cost-sustainable part of the national transport infrastructure. Despite this, many are threatened as a result of owners seeking to release the value of their land and local planning authorities prioritising housing and other development on the land they occupy.

DCLG Planning Practice Guidance, (paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 54-012-20150313 at <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/transport-evidence-bases-in-plan-making/transport-evidence-bases-in-plan-making-guidance/>) recognises that aerodromes can confer connectivity benefits of more than local significance. Each site forms part of a larger national network and piecemeal closure without reference to their value as part of a strategic network can have far-reaching consequences.

2. BROWNFIELD SITE STATUS.

(See also detail paragraphs 9-17)

The potential for aerodrome sites to be used for housing became more feasible following the deletion in 2003 of the footnote in PPG13, noting that airfields and hospital grounds should not be considered brownfield sites. The new definition of previously developed land included in the Glossary (Annex 2) of the NPPF makes no specific reference to airfields or flying sites. This has resulted in an increasing tendency for local planning authorities to treat airfields as brownfield sites for land redevelopment.

Local Planning Authorities should be aware of the environmental credentials of the undeveloped areas of airfield sites and that GA flying sites could be considered as appropriate under NPPF allowance for the provision of “local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location”.

3. AIRFIELDS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

(See also detail paragraphs 18-29)

Inappropriate applications for wind turbines in proximity to aerodromes, often inside safeguarded areas forcing objections on safety grounds, represent a significant cost and time issue for airfield operators. The cumulative effect of large numbers of unassociated wind turbine or solar array developments in a specific area can also make such concerns more acute.

The NPPF directs decision makers to the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy Infrastructure (EN-1) which, at paragraph 5.4.2 states: *"It is essential that the safety of UK aerodromes, aircraft and airspace is not adversely affected by new energy infrastructure."*

Local Planning Authorities and aerodrome operators should work closely to understand the potential impact of renewable energy developments on aerodromes so that planners are aware of the risks to airfields and general aviation that such developments create and know which airfields in their areas could be affected and would need to be warned of any incoming application.

4. NOISE

(See also detail paragraphs 30-32)

There is widespread concern that the introduction of new noise sensitive development (such as housing) in close proximity to long-established noise generating sites (such as flying sites) may in future force the latter to alter their operations or even close down due to new (and foreseen) complaints.

Planners need to be aware of the extent to which certain levels of noise may be unavoidable consequences of maintaining levels of commercial activity at aerodromes and that this may constrain options for nearby developments.

5. SAFEGUARDING AND THE PLANNING PROCESS

(See also detail paragraphs 33-39)

There is a statutory obligation for Local Planning Authorities to refer planning applications in the vicinity of an aerodrome for CAA assessment for only 27 of the largest civilian aerodromes. All other civilian flying sites rely on voluntary or unofficial safeguarding. The response to this from local planning authorities has not always been consistent.

Local Planning Authorities and aerodrome operators should work closely to understand the potential impact of local developments near to aerodromes so that planners are aware of the risks to airfields and general aviation that such developments create and know which airfields in their areas could be affected and should be warned of any incoming application. Authorities should hold safeguarding maps and develop safeguarding procedures with operators wherever appropriate.

6. AIRFIELD VIABILITY, CLOSURES AND ASSET DISPOSAL

(Detail paragraphs 40-48)

For the promotion of local jobs and growth it is important to secure the on-going future and potential of GA aerodromes as a local and national resource. Planning authorities should be alert to the extent to which the rapid removal and sale of assets at an aerodrome could adversely affect the potential for bringing it back into operation.

Government guidance now reminds planning authorities that a working or former aerodrome could be put forward for consideration proposed as a site for mixed use development (NPPF paragraph 17) that includes continuing, adapting or restoring aviation services in addition to other uses.

Government guidance also requires planning authorities to have regard to the extent to which an aerodrome contributes to connectivity outside the authority's own boundaries, working together with other authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

Any change of use from its role as an airfield should only be permitted after the planning authority has fully considered the extent to which the aerodrome has contributed to connectivity outside its own boundaries. In addition options should be explored such as mixed use development, allowing aviation to be continued, developed or adapted alongside other land uses.

Planning authorities should consider encouraging owners of airports who intend that there should be a final closure and cessation of business to complete full and proper consultation, operate a cooling off or review period in which demolition, asset sale or other disposal of key airport equipment do not take place.

CONCLUSION

Despite the inevitable pressures from alternative requirements for land use and other commercial factors, General Aviation airfield operators have proved resilient, adaptable and self-sustaining in, largely without subsidy, maintaining an important element of transportation infrastructure. Maintaining access to a national network of general aviation airfields is vital to the continuing success of both the general aviation industry and the provision of a viable nationwide business, leisure and transport resource.

Pressures on land uses are high and the industry has long accepted the need to be proactive in engaging with local planners and the local community, to identify and promote the value of the activities undertaken on their sites, as well as mitigating environmental impacts. However it is clear that many Local Planning Authorities do not fully recognise the General Aviation sector's importance to either their local community or wider national prosperity.

Aviation is a dynamic sector of Britain's social and economic base, but for the industry to continue to play its role it requires both the safeguarding of the current aerodrome infrastructure and, via the proactive involvement of Local Planning Authorities in line with National Policy Planning Framework, the creation of long-term confidence to unlock investment to create growth in activity, with attractive and modern facilities for its users.

General Aviation Awareness Council
April 2015

NOTES:

Additional more detailed information on each of these key areas is attached in a following appendix.

Further information or advice is available on request from:

Stephen Slater
Vice-Chairman
General Aviation Awareness Council.

planning@gaac.org.uk



SECTOR-LED AIRFIELD PLANNING GUIDANCE IN MORE DETAIL:

CONNECTIVITY: THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL GA AIRFIELD INFRASTRUCTURE

1. While Commercial Air Transport or airline operations are focussed on scheduled flights from 25 airports around the UK, GAAC research indicates that GA in the UK uses more than 120 aerodromes licensed by the Civil Aviation Authority for non-scheduled passenger carrying use and between 350 and 500 unlicensed flying sites. These can range from former military aerodromes with mile-long runways, to smaller airfields with grass runways and privately owned 'farm strips' and helipads. Almost all these airfields are privately owned and operated, gain no subsidy and directly contribute to their local communities in rates and the generation of salaries.
2. This network of GA aerodromes around the UK provides vital connectivity for business travellers and acts as an important part of the national transport infrastructure, providing economic benefit to the country as a whole, providing 'point to point' access, allowing passengers and cargoes to be delivered closer to their ultimate destination, saving time and cost. They also provide important infrastructure and support for activities such as police and pollution patrols, medical flights, aerial surveys and civil search and rescue operations. Many flights are also made by private individuals who fly their own aircraft or a hired aircraft to these aerodromes for business or social purposes.
3. Despite protection in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 33) and the Government Aviation Policy Framework, a number of airfields have closed and others have been threatened as a result of owners seeking to release the value of their land and local planning authorities prioritising housing and other development on the land they occupy.
4. In addition the refusal of planning permissions for the updating of essential aerodrome facilities, or the imposition of unreasonably restrictive limitations on acceptable uses can act as a potential blockage to ancillary development necessary to provide future financial viability.
5. Disruption of this national network of smaller, local airfields by piecemeal closure without reference to their value as part of a strategic network can have far-reaching consequences. A recent temporary closure of Blackpool airport in late 2014, had known effects on regular aircraft movements as far afield as Buckinghamshire, Gloucestershire, Hampshire and Oxfordshire as, without a convenient destination for planned business and social flights to the Fylde area, the flights were merely cancelled, with those involved being forced to resort to less efficient, more time-consuming alternative means of travel.
6. DCLG Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 54-012-20150313 at <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/transport-evidence-bases-in-plan-making/transport-evidence-bases-in-plan-making-guidance/>) recognises that aerodromes can confer connectivity benefits of more than local significance. Each site forms part of a larger national network and piecemeal closure without reference to their value as part of a strategic network can have far-reaching consequences.
7. The Government's March 2015 General Aviation Strategy notes that opposition to aerodrome development is often high within local communities, especially where the potential benefits of a GA airfield to the area may be poorly understood, while the potential adverse effects such as noise are

publicised and more readily appreciated. The recent GA research recommends that the Government should continue to encourage planning authorities to ensure that they take into account in their Local Plans and in all planning decisions the economic and employment roles the local airfields play.

8. Local Planning Authorities need to work collaboratively, especially as GA is not a “local” issue and each site forms part of a larger national network. Planning strategically across local boundaries is reflected in paragraphs 178 to 181 of the NPPF (and the Localism Act), although the emphasis there is on strategic priorities.

BROWNFIELD SITE STATUS.

9. Possibly the single biggest threat to GA aerodromes in UK today has been developers’ interest in aerodromes as potential housing locations and pressure on aerodrome owners to sell up. The past year has seen an acceleration of the already worrying trend of aerodromes closing or coming under threat. One factor has been the deletion in 2003 of the footnote in PPG13, noting that airfields and hospital grounds should not be considered brownfield sites.
10. The original PPG statement had excluded airfields from consideration and an assurance was given at the time to GAAC President, Lord Rotherwick by Baroness Andrews and in the lower house by Yvette Cooper, that this ‘oversight’ would be remedied. It has however been overtaken by the new planning system, with the result that local planning authorities now treat airfields as brownfield sites.
11. While PPG13 has now been superceded by the NPPF, the GA Challenge Panel’s 2013 report stated that: “... *the allocation of these unlicensed sites as brown field, and their inclusion in the strategic housing land availability policy means that when applications for re-development are submitted to the local planning authority there is no planning policy to support their retention.*”
12. The new definition of previously developed land included in the Glossary (Annex 2) of the NPPF makes no specific reference to airfields or flying site, but states: “*Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated infrastructure*”
13. It is noteworthy that the curtilage of many airfields is recognised as an important ‘open green space’ by many Local Planning Authorities and there is increasing evidence from local nature and environmental surveys that airfields are increasingly important as a low-insecticide, low-herbicide, sanctuary for plants, insects and associated wildlife.
14. Future developments at airfields are also pressurised by the application of Green Belt policy without full consideration of the openness of the greater part of an aerodrome site. York Aviation in their research published in March 2015 noted that they were aware of many GA aerodromes that have experienced protracted difficulties with the planning system, with local planning authorities according little or no weight to the need for modernisation, followed by lengthy and costly appeal processes often with a negative outcome. This presents a high regulatory burden for smaller aerodromes, which are often small businesses operating on small profit margins.
15. For example, Elvington Airfield near York was refused planning permission on appeal for hangar development necessary to sustain on-going aviation activity due to concerns about the interaction with a nearby Special Protection Area (SPA) and Redhill Aerodrome in Surrey has been refused permission, on the grounds largely of in principle harm to the Green Belt, for an all-weather runway that was necessary to enable it to handle more modern aircraft, without which its long term viability is at risk. This risk was not considered sufficient to constitute very special circumstances sufficient to overcome Green Belt objections.

16. Other airfield locations, such as at Bourn in Cambridgeshire, Kemble in Gloucestershire and Wellesbourne near Stratford-upon-Avon, are threatened by future potential changes of use of their sites for housing development and the consequent loss of the aerodromes.
17. Local Planning Authorities should be aware of the environmental credentials of the undeveloped areas of airfield sites and should be aware that GA flying sites could be considered appropriate under NPPF allowance for the provision of “local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location”..

AIRFIELDS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

18. Given the heavy emphasis on sustainable development, which is at the core of the National Planning Policy Framework, it is inevitable that there is a policy presumption in favour of all forms of renewable energy. A footnote 17 at page 23 of the NPPF specifically directs decision makers to the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy Infrastructure (EN-1) which, at paragraph 5.4.2 states: *“It is essential that the safety of UK aerodromes, aircraft and airspace is not adversely affected by new energy infrastructure.”*
19. While in all cases, the consideration and approval of the windfarm application is a matter for the relevant Local Planning Authority, the Civil Aviation Authority has produced detailed guidance covering the issue of aviation and windfarms in its CAP 764 document. This covers both the statutorily protected sites as well as those regarded as non-statutory.
20. This is a valid and important consideration, as a number of developers have made inappropriate applications for wind turbines in close proximity to aerodromes, often inside safeguarded areas.
21. In addition to the obvious risk of collision, there are other safety factors involved such as the risk of distraction, blade-light flicker and the risk of downwind vortex turbulence from the fast-moving turbine blade tips, which according to industry-agreed research, may extend downwind for up to 16 times the diameter of the turbine blades. For larger airfields, potential disruption of radar coverage by blade interference is also a significant issue.
22. Statutorily-protected sites: Large airports, NATS and the MoD are given statutory protection from development. Therefore any developer must consult them and ensure that they are content for the proposed development to proceed.
23. Non-statutorily protected sites: For smaller airports and aerodromes, there is no statutory safeguarding. However, Section 3.2 of CAP 764 states:
24. *“Those aerodromes and CNS sites that are not safeguarded by statutory process can be unofficially safeguarded by agreeing protection measures with their Local Planning Authority.”(See also section 5 of this document; Safeguarding and the Planning Process).*
25. Sections 1.10 and 1.11 of CAP 764 state: *“Operators of licensed aerodromes which are not officially safeguarded and operators of unlicensed aerodromes and sites for other aviation activities (for example, gliding or parachuting) should take steps to protect their locations from the effects of possible adverse development by establishing an agreed consultation procedure between themselves and the local planning authority or authorities. Local planning authorities are asked to respond sympathetically to requests for non-official safeguarding.”*
26. *“The safeguarding of unlicensed aerodromes is therefore a matter of discussion between the operator and the Local Planning Authority and the need for constructive liaison from an early stage is evident.”*

27. Objecting to inappropriate development represents a significant cost and time issue for airfield operators. There is also some evidence that owners and operators of aerodromes are not always advised that an application has been made and, as a result, have missed out on the opportunity to comment.
28. Recent requests to develop solar power arrays on and near aerodromes may also potentially affect airfield safety by their erosion of safe landing areas in cases of emergency. As with wind turbines, there are concerns that the cumulative effect of large numbers of unassociated developments may make such concerns even more acute.
29. Local planning authorities and aerodrome operators should work closely to understand that potential impact of renewable energy developments on aerodromes so that planners are aware of the risks to airfields and general aviation that such developments create and know what airfields in their areas could be affected and would not to be warned of any incoming application.

NOISE

30. Housing land allocation is driving development in areas of ever closer proximity to airfield boundaries. While existing safeguarding rules adequately regulate safety issues such as vertical intrusion and safety zones, there is an increasing concern that the introduction of new noise sensitive development (such as housing) in close proximity to long-established noise generating sites (such as flying sites) may in future force the latter to alter their operations or even close down due to new (and foreseen) complaints.
31. Previous planning advice has traditionally been focused primarily upon the introduction of a noise-generating activity upon existing development. The NPPF has partially addressed this with a bullet point in paragraph 123, which states that: *“Planning policies and decisions should aim to: Recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established.”*
32. Planners need to be aware of the extent to which certain levels of noise may be unavoidable consequences of maintaining levels of commercial activity at aerodromes and that this may constrain options for nearby developments.

SAFEGUARDING AND THE PLANNING PROCESS

33. The safeguarding process is a key mechanism for dialogue between local planning authorities, aerodrome operators and the Civil Aviation Authority. This is enshrined in CAA document CAP 738 *Safeguarding of Aerodromes*.
34. There is a statutory obligation for LPAs to refer planning applications in the vicinity of an aerodrome for CAA assessment for military flying sites and only 27 of the largest civilian aerodromes. For the remainder, the CAA advises that the LPA should give due consideration to the expertise of the aerodrome operator. This is in line with government policy (ODPM circular 1/2003 (and Scottish Executive Planning Circular 2/2003))
35. The lodging of voluntary safeguarding information with relevant local planning authorities is mandatory for operators of flying sites licensed for the carriage of paid passengers (CAA CAP168, Licensed Aerodromes) and guidelines for operations at unlicensed flying sites (CAA CAP 793, Safety at Unlicensed Aerodromes) recommends that voluntary or unofficial safeguarding agreements are made with the appropriate LPAs.

36. Safeguarding in planning law means to safeguard an established land use. In reference to aviation it is achieved by a process of checking proposed developments so as to:
- Protect the blocks of air through which aircraft fly, by preventing penetration of surfaces created to identify their lower limits.
 - Avoid any increase in the risk to aircraft of a birdstrike by preventing development such as rubbish tips which may increase hazardous bird species in the vicinity of an airfield.
 - Protect the integrity of radar and other electronic aids to air navigation, by preventing reflections of the radio signals involved.
 - Protect visual aids, such as approach and runway lighting, by preventing them from being obscured, or prevent the installation of other lights which could be confused for them.
37. It is noteworthy that the response from local planning authorities is not consistent. Sometimes authorities resist accepting unofficial safeguarding. For example an application was rejected for a safeguarding zone around an aerodrome in the south-west of England, the council instead offering a “constraint maps” agreement, and other local authorities have also resisted becoming involved due to the perceived bureaucracy required.
38. Even if a local authority accepts a safeguarding map, experience demonstrates they don’t always adhere to it and they do not necessarily notify the aerodrome operator of applications for development. For example Denham Aerodrome’s owners discovered in 2008, that during an office move its local council had lost the safeguarding maps that had been deposited with them. A further recent case was a failure to consult with an aerodrome operator, only highlighted when a County Council shortlisted a site close to the end of a runway for a waste incineration plant with a tall chimney.
39. Local planning authorities and aerodrome operators should work more closely to help planning authorities better understand the potential impact of local developments near to aerodromes so that planners are aware of the risks to airfields and general aviation that such developments create, and to know what airfields are in their areas.

AIRFIELD VIABILITY, CLOSURE, ASSET-DISPOSAL

40. Despite the inevitable pressures from alternative requirements for land use and other commercial factors, General Aviation airfield operators have proved resilient, adaptable and self-sustaining in, largely without subsidy, maintaining an important element of transportation infrastructure. The recent York Aviation report for the DfT focuses on the financial, social and economic benefits that GA airfields bring to the country and on suggestions of means of developing this further.
41. It is important that the planning sector helps rather than hinders this development process, by ensuring that proposed changes of use do not negatively affect the viability of the aerodrome operation, and that proposed necessary developments are enabled to secure the on-going future and potential of the aerodrome as a local and national resource.
42. Recent closures followed by the rapid dismantling of infrastructure at airports including Manston International, Sheffield Business Airport and Plymouth have highlighted these concerns. In contrast, when airport management companies at Coventry, Exeter and Blackpool were respectively forced to cease operations on financial grounds, a more proactive approach has allowed each of these airfields to reopen under new management and continue to serve their respective communities.

43. In the event of an aerodrome's closure, there is a statutory requirement (s35 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982) that currently applies to a CAA-designated aerodrome (compulsory safeguarding) that the person having the management of the aerodrome shall provide *"adequate facilities for consultation with respect to any matter concerning the management or administration of the aerodrome which affects the interests"* of:
- i. users of the aerodrome;*
 - ii. any local authority in whose area the aerodrome is situated; and*
 - iii. any other organisation representing the interests of persons concerned with the locality in which the aerodrome is situated."*
44. Guidance published for Airport Consultative Committees in April 2014 states that the Government recommends representation of these statutory consultees through a consultative committee formed for this purpose. However this guidance does not specifically mention consulting on the closure of an airport or airfield.
45. Planning authorities should be alert to the extent to which the rapid removal and sale of assets at an aerodrome could adversely affect the potential for bringing it back into operation. Government guidance now reminds planning authorities that a working or former aerodrome could be put forward for consideration proposed as a site for mixed use development (NPPF paragraph 17) that includes continuing, adapting or restoring aviation services in addition to other uses.
46. Government guidance also requires planning authorities to have regard to the extent to which an aerodrome contributes to connectivity outside the authority's own boundaries, working together with other authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.
47. Any change of use from its role as an airfield should only be permitted after the planning authority has fully considered the extent to which the aerodrome has contributed to connectivity outside its own boundaries. In addition options should be explored such as mixed use development, allowing aviation to be continued, developed or adapted alongside other land uses.
48. Planning authorities should consider encouraging owners of airports who intend that there should be a final closure and cessation of business to complete full and proper consultation, and implement a cooling off or review period in which demolition, asset sale or other disposal of key airport equipment does not take place.

ENDS

Further information or advice is available from:

Stephen Slater
Vice-Chairman
General Aviation Awareness Council.

planning@gaac.org.uk