PROPOSED HAMPSHIRE AIR FESTIVAL AT THRUXTON AIRFIELD 12-13 SEPT 2026

REPORT OF MEETING AND PRESENTATION HELD AS PART OF KIMPTON ANNUAL PARISH MEETING AT KIMPTON VILLAGE HALL ON WEDNESDAY 27TH MAY 2026

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report summarises concerns raised by residents of Kimpton Parish during the public meeting held on 27 May 2026 regarding the proposed Hampshire Air Festival and associated flying display organised by Montserrat Events & Festivals Ltd.

1.2 A recurring theme throughout the meeting was the extent to which local residents appeared to be identifying environmental, heritage, livestock, public access and operational considerations that had not previously been presented by the organisers. During the course of the discussion, residents identified livestock locations, rookeries, conservation areas, listed buildings, public rights of way and likely secondary spectator locations.

1.3 Residents expressed concern that significant elements of local knowledge were being identified as a result of their presentation rather than being presented as matters already considered during the development of the display plan. In several instances, the organisers acknowledged that further work was required to understand the significance of issues raised by residents.

1.4 Additional concerns were raised regarding livestock welfare, heritage assets, public rights of way, secondary spectators, conservation areas, noise management, insurance arrangements, data protection compliance, economic impacts arising from road closures and the overall level of due diligence undertaken during the planning process.

1.5 At the time of the meeting, a number of regulatory approvals remained outstanding, including elements of the Civil Aviation Authority approval process, traffic management arrangements and licensing matters. Residents requested greater transparency regarding these processes and the opportunity for further consultation before any final decisions are taken by the council.

1.6 Due to time constraints, the meeting concluded before all questions could be addressed. It was therefore agreed that a further meeting would be required in order that outstanding issues be discussed and clarified.

2. KEY FINDINGS

2.1 Due Diligence and Local Knowledge

It should be noted that during his opening presentation Jonathan Moore explained that he had previously lived in Andover and stated that he "knew the area very well". Residents therefore expressed surprise at a number of local factors raised during the meeting,

Residents raised concerns regarding the extent of local due diligence undertaken during the preparation of Version 9 of the display map, supplied by Montserrat Events & Festivals Ltd. During the meeting, Flight Display Director Barney Wainwright confirmed that whilst he had surveyed the area using maps, satellite imagery and drive thru site visits, he had not walked the proposed flight display zone within Kimpton Parish.

Throughout the meeting, residents identified a number of local factors that had not previously been considered by the organisers, including livestock locations, rookeries, conservation areas, listed buildings, public rights of way and likely secondary spectator locations. Residents expressed concern that significant elements of local knowledge were being identified post presentation of their plans rather than having being assessed as part of the due diligence required for planning process.

2.2 Livestock, Horses and Racing Stables

Councillor Lashbrook had informed Jonathan Moore that there were no livestock in the area which was factually incorrect. Residents highlighted the presence of horses, cattle, sheep and other livestock within and beneath the proposed flight display area. Particular concern was raised regarding cattle that would be in calf or accompanied by young calves during the event period and the presence of both leisure and racing horses within close proximity and under the display area. It was highlighted that horses have a strong flight response and that sudden exposure to low flying aircraft could increase the risk of distress, panic or injury to the animals and indeed their handlers.

It became apparent during the meeting that not all livestock owners had been contacted despite some having registered concerns through the organisers' webform. Whilst the organisers proposed engagement with livestock owners and, where possible, suggesting relocation of animals as a mitigation measure, residents advised that relocation would not be practical or achievable.

The organisers acknowledged the presence of local racing stables and advised that pilots would be briefed regarding their location. Residents questioned whether sufficient assessment had been undertaken regarding the impact of low-flying aircraft, noise and disruption upon horses, staff, training activities and associated equine businesses. The organisers development of suitable mitigation methods appeared to be incomplete at the time of the meeting.

2.3 Heritage Assets and Listed Buildings

Questions were raised regarding the consideration given to listed buildings within and adjacent to the proposed display area. Flight Display Director Barney Wainwright confirmed that no specific assessment had been undertaken in relation to listed buildings and that Historic England had not been consulted as part of the display planning process.

Residents then identified Littleton Manor, a Grade II listed seventeenth-century timber-framed building, as being located approximately 66 metres from the edge of the proposed display area and advised that numerous other listed buildings were situated within approximately 250 metres of the display zones.

2.4 Environmental Considerations

Residents advised the organisers of the existence of a rookery located within the proposed display area. When questioned, Mr Wainwright confirmed that he had not been aware of its existence prior to the meeting despite acknowledging that bird strike is an issue that must always be considered in aviation operations.

Residents also advised the organisers that a significant proportion of Kimpton Parish falls within a designated conservation area. Mr Wainwright confirmed that he was unaware of the location of the conservation area and a resident subsequently provided a map identifying its location.

Residents expressed concern that environmental constraints of this nature had not been identified during the planning process prior to the public meeting.

2.5 Public Rights of Way and Secondary Spectators

Questions were raised regarding the identification of potential secondary spectator locations. When asked why such locations were not shown on the display map, Flight Display Director Barney Wainwright advised that, in the absence of a previous airshow at Thruxton, the organisers did not know where members of the public might choose to gather.

Residents challenged this position, noting the existence of well-established public footpaths, open spaces and viewing locations within the parish. It was further noted that some of these locations are situated beneath or adjacent to proposed display zones.

The organisers advised that certain footpaths would be marshalled during the event even though there was no evidence of this on the map of the display zone. Residents subsequently questioned what authority marshals would possess to restrict access to public rights of way. No specific legal mechanism for preventing public access was identified during the meeting.

When discussing the use of public spaces by Kimpton residents during the display period, Jonathan Moore stated:

"...we're putting these things in place to try and basically enable us to do something and for people to go, right, I'll go away for the weekend or I won't bother going out. I'll actually go to the air show."

2.6 Noise Management and Community Impact

Questions were raised regarding the existence of a local noise abatement zone affecting parts of Kimpton Parish and whether this had been considered within the planning process.

Jonathan Moore advised that a Noise Management and Community Impact document had been prepared and submitted as part of the event planning process. However, no details regarding the document's contents were provided during the meeting despite numerous requests.

When asked whether the document would be made available for public review, Jonathan Moore stated that he would "take advice on that". No commitment was made during the meeting to release the document and residents therefore remained unable to review its contents.

2.7 Economic Impact on Residents and Businesses

Residents raised concerns regarding the economic impact of the proposed event upon local residents and businesses.

It was stated that road closures and diversion routes would impose additional travel costs upon the community, estimated by residents at approximately £980 during the event period. Concerns were also raised regarding the impact upon local businesses, including the village pub, The Welcome Stranger, where it was suggested that reduced accessibility would have a significant impact upon trade, on what are its busiest trading days.

Residents questioned whether any assessment had been undertaken regarding economic impacts or whether any compensation would be made available for those affected. It was unclear as to why Councillor Lashbrook took to answer this question rather than the event organisers.

2.8 Community Benefits

Residents questioned what specific benefits the proposed event would bring to the Kimpton community.

When asked directly what benefits the airshow would provide for the community he represented, Councillor Philip Lashbrook replied:

"For Kimpton, I can't say at the moment."

When pressed further, he added:

"It depends if you're interested in aviation, yes."

Residents expressed concern that no clear and measurable benefits for Kimpton residents had been identified during this part of the discussion.

2.9 Insurance Arrangements

Jonathan Moore confirmed that the event was covered by £10 million of public liability insurance.

Residents questioned whether this level of cover was proportionate to the scale of the event and the value of properties located within and around the display area. Concerns were raised regarding the potential consequences of a major incident involving residential property, livestock, businesses or racing facilities.

Residents cited examples of high-value properties and equine operations within the area and questioned whether the stated insurance cover would be sufficient to meet potential liabilities.

2.10 Data Protection and ICO Registration

Questions were raised regarding the collection and processing of personal data by Montserrat Events & Festivals Ltd.

Residents noted that the organisation was collecting names, addresses, email addresses, telephone numbers and household information as part of its ticket registration and consultation activities.

Residents stated that checks of the public Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) register had failed to identify Montserrat Events & Festivals Ltd as being registered at the time of the meeting, despite the organisation processing personal data obtained from local households.

2.11 Consultation Process and Information Quality

Residents raised concerns regarding what they perceived to be a lack of attention to detail in the administration and promotion of the event.

Examples discussed during the meeting included spelling and content errors on the event website, the publication of an incorrect website address on marketing material and faults within the online registration process. Residents also expressed concern regarding the timing and distribution of consultation material and the consistency with which information had been provided to affected households.

Whilst Jonathan Moore commented “Sir, it's immaterial, all right? It's fine, all right? We're offering the free tickets and people are accepting it.” and “It just shows we’re human sir”. Residents expressed concern that errors undermined confidence in the wider planning process.

It was also questioned as to why Jonathan Moore had only presented to Fyfield Parish Council in the presence of Cllr Lashbrook and not to Kimpton itself where the entire air display was taking place. Jonathan Moore had assumed that parish councils would speak to each other and apologised for making this error

Residents questioned why Jonathan Moore had presented his proposals to Fyfield Parish Council at an early stage of the project, in the presence of Councillor Lashbrook, whilst no equivalent presentation had been made to Kimpton Parish Council despite the proposed display area being located completely within Kimpton Parish.

During his presentation, Jonathan Moore explained that he had attended a Fyfield Parish Council meeting in January 2025 and had assumed that information regarding the proposed event would subsequently be shared between neighbouring parish councils. He later acknowledged that this assumption had been mistaken and apologised for the delay in engaging directly with Kimpton Parish Council.

2.12 Regulatory Approvals and Outstanding Permissions

Questions were raised regarding the status of licences, permissions and regulatory approvals required for the event to proceed.

Jonathan Moore confirmed that a number of processes remained ongoing, including traffic management approvals, licensing matters and Civil Aviation Authority authorisations. During questioning by Caroline Nokes MP it was confirmed that amendments had been requested by the Civil Aviation Authority and that with relation to road closures and local licensing “Well, we have. We basically have been talking with Councillor Lashbrook , so I'm going to basically working with him” It was noted by Caroline Nokes MP that “with all due respect, you do not apply via Phil.”

Residents noted that significant aspects of the event remained subject to regulatory review and approval at the time of the meeting and requested greater clarity regarding the status of these processes and opportunities for public scrutiny.

2.13 Consultation and Distribution of Information

Concerns were raised regarding the timing and distribution of consultation material provided to residents. It was noted during the meeting that some information had not been circulated as early as expected and that distribution across the village had been inconsistent.

Residents expressed concern that delayed receipt of information reduced the time available to review the proposals, consider the implications of the event and prepare questions for the public meeting. It was suggested that future consultation exercises should make greater use of local knowledge and utilise local distribution networks to ensure that information reaches all affected households in a timely and consistent manner.

2.14 Unresolved Questions

Due to time constraints, the meeting concluded before all questions from residents could be addressed. A number of issues remained unresolved at the conclusion of the session and several members of the public were unable to raise all of their questions.

It was therefore agreed that a further meeting would be required to enable outstanding matters to be discussed and clarified.

3. CONCLUSION

The meeting highlighted a significant number of concerns held by residents regarding the proposed air display and its potential impact upon the village of Kimpton and surrounding communities.

Whilst the organisers indicated a willingness to continue engagement and consultation, residents repeatedly questioned whether sufficient local due diligence had been undertaken prior to the publication of the display map and supporting documentation. Throughout the meeting, residents identified a number of environmental, heritage, livestock and public access considerations that had not previously been presented by the organisers as matters already assessed.

Many attendees expressed concern that key local constraints and sensitivities had only emerged during the consultation process and that several important questions remained unanswered at the conclusion of the meeting.

Given the number of unresolved issues and the fact that a number of regulatory approvals remained outstanding, residents requested that all concerns raised during the meeting be fully considered by the relevant licensing authorities and the Test Valley Borough Council Safety Advisory Group before any final decisions are made regarding the event.