

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 2nd June 2010 at the Heathrow Academy

PRESENT:

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Sam Jones, Chairman | - | HACC |
| Carole Havercroft, Secretary | - | HACC |
| Cllr. Anita MacDonald | - | LB Hillingdon |
| Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed (Deputy) | - | LB Hillingdon |
| Cllr. Corinna Smart | - | LB Hounslow |
| Cllr. Alan Barber (Deputy) | - | LB Hounslow |
| Cllr. David Rowlands | - | Bucks CC |
| Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy) | - | RB Windsor & Maidenhead |
| Cllr. Moreton Moore | - | Runnymede BC |
| Cllr. Dev Dhillon | - | South Bucks DC |
| Cllr. George Trussler | - | Spelthorne BC |
| Murad Qureshi | - | London Assembly |
| Virginia Godfrey | - | HACAN/Clearskies |
| Susan Parsons | - | ABTA |
| James Fremantle | - | AUC |
| Margaret Majumdar | - | EANAG |
| Isobel Knox (Deputy) | - | IATA |
| Rob Gibson | - | LAANC |
| Iain Hope | - | LCCI |
| John Gurney | - | TUC |
| Andy Hull | - | Independent |
| Keith Harlow | - | Independent |
| Lara Reed | - | Independent |

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

| | | |
|---------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Nick Cullen | - | Chief Operating Officer |
| Simon Baugh | - | Director of Airport Communications |
| Allan Gregory | - | Surface Access Director |
| Cheryl Monk | - | Strategic Communications Manager |

PRESENTERS

| | | |
|-------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Joe Hardman | - | BAA Economic Development Manager |
|-------------|---|----------------------------------|

OTHERS

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Frank Evans | - | DfT |
|-------------|---|-----|

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

1. Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

Philip Carlisle, (HACC Adviser), Brian Yates (Consumers' Association), Mike Forster (BAA), Nigel Milton (BAA), Cllr. Christopher Turrell (Bracknell Forest BC), Cllr. Jim Maddan (LB Wandsworth), Cllr. Ruth Cadbury (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Bassam Mahfouz (LB Ealing), Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Geoff Acton (LB Richmond upon Thames), Cllr. Denise Grant (Spelthorne BC), Cllr. Balvinder Bains & Cllr. James Walsh (Slough BC), Richard Taylor (Independent), Ian Ramsay (Independent), Susan Laurie (Independent), Anne Godfrey (GTMC).

4356 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 31st March 2010 were agreed as an accurate record.

4357 MATTERS ARISING

(a) Minute 4339 – Establish when Tactically Enhanced Departures (TED) operated (Simon Baugh).

1. Simon Baugh advised that this related to the time that taxiway work might take to complete, which would require Tactically Enhanced Departures (TED) to be operated on the runway. He confirmed the time period would be at least 24-months. An update would be provided to the Committee prior to the start.
2. Margaret Majumdar asked if this was the time it would take for regular alternation on easterlies rather than the occasional departure on easterlies, which it was understood the Tactically Enhanced Departures (TED) would involve. Originally, the Committee had been told that such works could occur between February and May of this year.

Simon Baugh replied that this depended on the extent to which the work was required. The taxiways needed to be re-done in order for normal operations to continue on the Northern Runway for easterly departures. Obviously, up until now this had been barred by the Cranford Agreement.

The Members would recollect, that a presentation had been made last July by Tim Hardy, BAA Airside Director on the abolition of the Cranford Agreement, (as announced by the Secretary of State in January 2009) and what this would mean for the affected residents surrounding Heathrow. It was explained that the scope of work involved additional entrance links onto the Northern Runway in order to operate that efficiently.

There was no ban on alternation for arrivals. This meant that for most of the day this could be operated. In the period at the end of the day, there was nothing to prevent BAA occasionally using TED for departures.

Even when the Cranford Agreement was in place, TED was operated occasionally. However, it was understood there had been no change to operations as a result of the Government's policy on the Cranford Agreement.

It was not known if the new Government's decision to change airport policies would also include re-looking at the Cranford Agreement.

3. Frank Evans stated that it should be taken into account that the Cranford Agreement decision formed part of the Heathrow expansion debate. Whilst the new Government had relayed their policy on expansion at Heathrow, which was the first statement they actually made, no other changes had yet been agreed

(b) Minute 4339 – Provide Virginia Godfrey with a copy of DEFRA policy document - 'Air Pollution: Action in a Changing Climate' (Frank Evans).

1. Frank Evans apologised that this had not yet been provided. There would now be a further policy document published, but no announcement had yet been made.

ACTION:
FRANK
EVANS

(c) Minute 4339 – Provide Rob Gibson with a copy of the first draft BAA Noise Action Plan (Rick Norman).

1. The Chairman stated that, over the past few months, both Rob Gibson representing LAANC and Margaret Majumdar representing EANAG had requested a copy of the draft.

The Chairman read verbatim the following statement that Rick Norman, BAA Head of Noise & Air Quality had provided:-

'We have not released a copy of the draft Noise Action Plan yet as we expect the process to be complete in the next month or so. Following on from our update at the last HACC, we have met with the DfT and DEFRA as part of the adoption process, and are in the process of making a few minor amendments in anticipation of formal adoption, hopefully by July 2010. What I can say is, that as a direct result of the consultation process, we increased the total number of actions in the plan from around 58 to 67. Around 38 of the actions in the revised draft could be described as new, which compares to around 19 in the original draft.

Specific actions which we are currently committed to in 2010 aside from our "business as usual" activities include:

- Establishing a Community Noise and Track Monitoring Program.
- Engaging airline partners in dialogue about the voluntary phase out by 2015 of the marginally compliant Chapter 3 aircraft.
- Commissioning a report on the noise performance of the A380 aircraft.
- Developing a schedule for the implementation of the changes necessary to implement the ending of the Cranford Agreement.
- Requesting that DfT undertake a review of the existing departure noise limit restrictions regime by 2013.
- A review of the fining levels for breaches of the departure noise limits and establishing annual rate of inflation increases.
- Undertaking a review of our existing noise insulation schemes developing a quarterly FEU Report for web publication.
- Establishing an independent audit process to verify stated progress against the Action Plan.
- Reviewing our complaint handling processes and communications.
- Commissioning Lden, Lnight, Levening, 6.5 hour night contours.

Of course, the action plan is a living document and will be reviewed on an annual basis, at which point new actions may be added or existing ones amended.

We expect the NTKWG to be closely involved in tracking progress against the Plan.

We will of course keep members of the HACCC fully informed and notify them as soon as the adoption process is complete'.

2. The Chairman said that the statement indicated that the Committee would not receive a copy of the draft Noise Action Plan, but had shown the direction in which BAA were moving.

The Chairman asked Frank Evans to comment on the procedure throughout the country for the draft Noise Action Plans and whether they had been made available to other Consultative Committees.

Frank Evans responded that no airport had released its draft Noise Action Plan to its Consultative Committee.

Margaret Majumdar interjected that she understood that a member of the Gatwick Consultative Committee had received sight of the airport's draft Noise Action Plan.

Frank Evans continued that in terms of process, the DfT and DEFRA were working with all the airports in this regard. The main challenge for a number of airports related to the fact that for several years they already had extensive noise mitigation schemes in place which would need to be revised as a result of the Noise Action Plan.

In relation to Heathrow, a revised Noise Action Plan should be available by the end of the month.

3. Rob Gibson stated that whilst he appreciated the comments made, the fact of the matter remained that when this was discussed originally, BAA had committed to release a copy of the original draft Noise Action Plan that had been submitted to the DfT and DEFRA. However, this has not been supplied, despite repeated requests.

Since the issue was last raised, a further request had been received from a resident member from the LB Richmond to see if the matter could be addressed.

The only reason a copy was requested was to see if all the consultation responses submitted by people had been included in the draft Noise Action Plan and taken on board or otherwise. It was not for insidious reasons.

4. Margaret Majumdar echoed the comment made by Rob Gibson. The response to the draft Noise Action Plan was a major piece of work that both EANAG and other organisations would like to see the outcome of.
5. Simon Baugh agreed that Mike Brown, former BAA Chief Operating Officer, had undertaken at a previous HACC meeting to release a copy of the draft Noise Action Plan to the Committee, but BAA did amend this decision and state their position afterwards. Having undergone the Noise Action Plan consultation and then being very close to the DfT and DEFRA releasing the final Noise Action Plan, it was not thought beneficial to introduce this extra stage of sending out the original draft, followed by the response that was submitted to Government by BAA.

Everybody would be able to see how their views had been submitted into the final response when the DfT and DEFRA are able to make this available, given that it was a relatively short period of time since the new Government had been formed.

6. Rob Gibson further commented that the original request for a copy of the draft Noise Action Plan was made during discussions at HACC meetings in the early part of the year. It was felt that the point was being laboured in vain. BAA had committed to release a copy, but did not honour this. If BAA had changed their mind, this should have been explained to the Committee at the last meeting. BAA had their position, but did not follow this. LAANC had requested a copy because they believed it would be useful.

4358 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

1. Committee Membership

- (a) Following the local Elections in May 2010, letters had been received from:-
 - London Borough of Hillingdon** confirming the appointment of Cllr. Dominic Gilham, Cllr. Scott Seaman-Digby and Cllr. Anita MacDonald as the HACC Members with Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed as Deputy, **London Borough of Hounslow** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Ruth Cadbury as the HACC Member and appointment of Cllr. Peter de Vic Carey as Deputy, Cllr. Barbara Reid as the HACC Member and Cllr. Alan Barber as Deputy, Cllr. Corinna Smart as the HACC Member and Cllr. Mohinder Gill as Deputy, **London Borough of Ealing** confirming the appointment of Cllr. Bassam Mahfouz as the HACC Member and Cllr. Surinder Varma as Deputy, **Runnymede Borough Council** confirming the appointment of Cllr. Moreton Moore as the HACC Member and Cllr. Christopher Knight as Deputy, **LB Richmond upon Thames** confirming the appointment of Cllr. Geoff Acton as the HACC Member and the appointment of Cllr. Martin Elengorn as Deputy, **Bracknell Forest Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Christopher Turrell as the HACC Member and appointment of Cllr. Mary Ballin as Deputy, **Slough Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Balvinder Bains as the HACC Member and Cllr. James Walsh as Deputy.

2. The Chairman referred to the letter submitted by Rob Gibson relevant to 'Proposals for Runway 3 at Heathrow' It was mainly focused on the legal arguments at the High Court Hearing of the Judicial Review, which had taken place between the London Borough of Hillingdon and others versus the Department for Transport.

Due to the policy shift away from the development of a third runway, a request had been made in the letter if BAA, the airline representatives and the Department for Transport could outline their respective current thinking with regard to the runway 3 proposal and any other expansion related activity.

3. Rob Gibson stated that the reason for his submission of the letter, was the fact that at the time of the last HACC meeting, he and BAA were at completely different positions. BAA had described the situation as 'business as usual' but he disagreed with that. However, time had moved on and the Judge came out with some further statements of the cost series, insomuch as he supported the position adopted by the LAANC.

Rob continued that the HACC Minutes were a matter of public record and he would like to think that the fact the local authorities took the case and effectively won with a substantial victory, should rightfully form part of those Minutes. He did not agree with BAA's interpretation of the Court verdict and felt vindicated by the statement made by the Judge.

4359 HEATHROW MANAGEMENT MATTERS

1. (a) Introduction and dialogue with Mr. Nick Cullen, Chief Operating Officer of Heathrow Airport.

Nick Cullen advised the Committee members that he had joined BAA on 9th March 2010 to take up his role. He had spent many years working in different operational environments, where much of the issues were the same. He said that he looked forward to working with each member of HACC at the appropriate level, as it was appreciated that many had been involved with the various debates for a long time.

One of the interesting aspects of Heathrow Airport was that it had multiple stakeholders, which was relatively unusual.

- (b) BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

Mr. Cullen presented his Heathrow Update report with Allan Gregory (*enclosed*).

2. The Chairman referred to the letter submitted by Rob Gibson and asked if there was any known expansion related activity in the pipeline.

Simon Baugh responded that there was none, other than those the Committee already knew about. The proposals for Air Track were ongoing. BAA had also been involved in discussions with High Speed 2, relevant to high speed rail and how this might link into Heathrow.

However, although BAA were not continuing work on a planning application for a third runway, their position remained that this would still be of benefit to the country and a long-term solution to the airport's capacity problem. Therefore, whilst BAA were not continuing with this on the basis that do so in the absence of Government policy would ultimately be futile, they would continue to work with Government to ensure the airports policy provides strong global trading links to support the UK's long-term competitiveness.

3. Murad Qureshi said he noted that BAA had not discounted operational increases on flights from Heathrow or mixed-mode. This was a big issue of debate.

Simon Baugh responded that the limit of 480,000 air transport movements (ATMs) per year was put in place by the Terminal 5 Inquiry. That remained and was the operational limit for air traffic. BAA would require a planning application to overturn the Terminal 5 planning decision, and it was not a matter that could be done in the absence of policy.

BAA had made a case to Government during the consultation on adding capacity at Heathrow to support a third runway and mixed-mode and still believed that this would bring huge benefits to the airport. That said, there were no active planning applications or proposals to bring this about. Therefore, BAA were arguing in the context of the need for extra capacity at Heathrow, rather than any specific projects.

4. Iain Hope stated that with regard to the third runway, the London Chamber of Commerce which he represented, were strongly disappointed at the Government's views relative to Heathrow. Whilst the points of other HACC members around the table were understood, the concern of the LCCI was that the expansion of the economy was absolutely vital. To cut down on the number of destinations that could be reached from Heathrow would be going in the wrong direction.

The LCCI were looking as to see what could be done to ensure that the UK did get back on its economic feet again.

With regard to High Speed 2, the LCCI were very keen to see proper connections from Heathrow to the high speed rail link. There was much discussion at present on this relevant to Heathrow, the cost involved, also the fact that there should be an alternative station at Royal Oak and whether Heathrow Express should be altered on that basis, which would slow down the progress.

Therefore, the members were concerned that they were all kept closely in on the discussions on these matters, in order to give maximum input to what is a complex issue for productivity between the airport and High Speed 2.

Iain Hope referred to the question of compensation over the volcanic ash disruption. He thought that from a passenger viewpoint, and also the airlines and airport position, it was a very unsatisfactory situation regarding the enormous cost that had been incurred due to these circumstances.

It was known that within the insurance industry there was a clause used of an 'Act of God' on the policies which always worried people. However, there was not a bottomless bucket to supply compensation on these issues. From a passenger viewpoint, it was very important that there was clarification as soon as possible regarding what might happen should there be another incident, where there was compensation available, or what the alternatives might be in another form of insurance.

Further thought should be put into this matter as quickly as possible.

Nick Cullen responded that he understood the points made. Everyone wanted certainty and clarity, which from the perspective of BAA, they were working very hard on to achieve.

5. Frank Evans stated that in terms of the new Government's policy, the issue on expansion in the South-East was that the airports were to be 'better rather than bigger'. Regarding 'mixed-mode', Theresa Villiers MP, Minister for Aviation had stated that the Government were not in favour of 'mixed-mode'. This would be the subject of a paper within the next few months.
6. Rob Gibson stated that he was concerned that the night flight regime would shortly be due for review. He would not wish to see expansion into either the night-time period or shoulder period.
7. Cllr. Beer said that he wished to register the fact that some communities were very anxious indeed about the increasing use of TEAM in operation. It appeared to many people on the ground that 'mixed-mode' had been introduced by the 'back door'.

He requested that for a future meeting, precise figures could be made available on these movements which were occurring at all times of the day, not just during the recognised time period.

Simon Baugh agreed that BAA could provide a presentation to the Committee on TEAM at the August meeting.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

8. Cllr. Rowlands stated that Bucks County Council strongly opposed the main proposed route of High Speed 2. The project would cost in the region of £30 billion. Although Bucks CC did not oppose the scheme in principal, it was not understood why it was necessary to invest so much money in this project.

The Green Belt was set up after the Second World War. To construct a new rail line for High Speed 2 would involve digging up large tracks of this land. Bucks CC would be strongly lobbying Theresa Villiers MP, Philip Hammond MP and Lord Adonis to see if the scheme could be re-routed to prevent this. In this regard, Bucks CC not only opposed the expansion of Heathrow with a third runway, but High Speed Rail 2 as well.

9. Keith Harlow referred to the British Airways and Iberia merger. There had been some speculation in the Press that if this merger were to proceed, Madrid Airport might benefit over Heathrow in terms of the number of destinations directly served.

Nick Cullen responded that one of the challenges BAA had was that passengers had a choice to fly from any international European airport and did not necessarily travel through London Heathrow. If there was a better service being offered from Frankfurt, Charles de Gaulle or Schipol airports, passengers would use these airports. The merger clearly would have an impact locally.

10. Isobel Knox commented that whilst she was not at liberty to divulge information confidential to British Airways on the merger, the consequences of the Government's decision not to expand Heathrow would result in the fact that the trade would go elsewhere in Europe.
11. Cllr. Moreton Moore referred to Air Track. He asked if the tunnels at Egham were unfeasible, what steps could be taken to ensure that the level crossings were not closed for 40 minutes of each hour.

Allan Gregory responded that the Egham level crossing situation was recognised on the environmental impact. There were ongoing discussions with Surrey County Council to establish what could be done to minimise this impact and reach a solution.

12. John Gurney pointed out that in relation to the third runway being scrapped, this would in the long-term cause a threat to jobs at Heathrow.
13. Cllr. Beer endorsed the comments of Cllr. Moore representing Runnymede BC, as Windsor & Maidenhead had the same problem with the level crossings, which would be closed for 44 minutes out of each hour on the A30 with the proposed Air Track scheme. This would prove a disaster for everybody. The A30 served Heathrow and so one object would be defeated to achieve another.

4360 HEATHROW EMPLOYMENT SURVEY

1. Presentation by Joe Hardman, BAA Economic Development Manager on the Heathrow Employment Survey carried out every five years, which provides important information on the workforce size and characteristics of Heathrow, the UK's largest employment site (*enclosed*).

Following the presentation members asked questions/responded

2. Iain Hope said that in Joe Hardman's earlier career he had aspired to recruit people for Terminal 5. He asked if these staff had been retained to work on Heathrow East and were younger people employed.

Joe Hardman responded that there was a re-deployment service in existence. People were developed through apprenticeship programmes at the Retail Academy.

On 5th July 2010, the BAA Local Apprenticeship Fair will be held, which would offer the chance to find out more about some of the apprenticeship opportunities provided by companies linked to the airport.

Last year, over 600 young people, parents and teachers attended the Fair from within the five neighbouring boroughs.

3. John Gurney advised that British Airways had re-launched its Engineering Apprenticeship Programme with a three year intake, which was good.
4. Isobel Knox asked how did the statistics compare with other major employers.

Joe Hardman responded that the statistics compared well with Park Royal and Stockley Park.

5. Allan Clark commented that the statistics in the surface access paper had yet to be put out.
6. Cllr. MacDonald asked how the data was collated for such surveys, as residents had transport and parking issues they wished to register.

Joe Hardman confirmed that this data was collected by face-to-face surveys.

The Chairman thanked Joe Hardman for the informative presentation.

4361 AIR QUALITY AT HEATHROW

1. The BAA Air Quality Monitoring Report at Heathrow - Quarter 1 2010 and a BAA Update on the impact on noise and air quality resulting from the recent halting of flights from Heathrow due to the volcanic ash from Iceland had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Cllr. Moore stated that with reference to nitrogen dioxide, an EU limit is the value (40µg/m³) which should not be exceeded. It is unacceptable that even the annual means are exceeding this limit by wide margins. One can assume that individual measurements had exceeded this limit by even more and that they will continue to do so, endangering health.

Cllr. Moore asked the following three questions:-

- Q1. Are the actual values from the various monitoring sites available for the past year.
- Q2. What were the values during 15th-20th April when the risks arising from volcanic ash stopped all flying at Heathrow for six days.
- Q3. Do these figures bear out the statement that "background and road transport emissions account for approximately 80% of the NO_x measured at Oxford Avenue.

Simon Baugh responded that the (40µg/m³) for nitrogen dioxide was the annual mean of prolonged exposure. There will be points when this was over 40, but BAA were striving to deliver below 40.

In terms of Q1, the actual values of various monitoring sites was available on the BAA website heathrowairwatch.org.uk . The local authority information was also included.

Apart from the air quality monitors in residential areas, some of these were on the airport. These were used to measure the air quality and improve the modelling.

In terms of Q2 relevant to values, this type of information was included in the paper submitted by David Vowles, who it might be worth holding a conversation directly with on this matter. BAA could also obtain some additional figures.

However, the paper stated that compared to the model, the N02 reduction was less than BAA had expected. This would perhaps suggest that the quantum emissions from the airport were less, but it was made clear that the level of background and road transport emissions were higher during that period.

3. Isobel Knox stated that this suggested that the NOx emissions were lower at the airport and for those further away were the same.

Simon Baugh replied that the readings taken had shown this to be the case.

4. Murad Qureshi referred to David Vowles' report. He thought it had suggested that not enough was being done on transport measures. It appeared to be a disjointed approach.

Simon Baugh replied that during the five-day period of the volcanic ash, when no passengers were travelling to the airport, the road traffic was less. To get the emissions within the limit required a holistic approach.

Murad Qureshi referred to concentration levels. He asked when the investigative report by AEA Technology, who BAA had commissioned to study the impact on the air quality around Heathrow, during the closure period of the airport due to the volcanic ash, would be available.

Simon Baugh undertook to investigate this matter.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

It was agreed that a presentation would be arranged by BAA to share the Quarter 2 2010 air quality figures with the Committee at the next meeting.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

4362 UK AVIATION UPDATE

1. This paper and its Appendices (Item 3) prepared for the UK Airport Consultative Committees Annual Meeting to be held on 3rd June 2010, which would be attended by the Chairman, HACC Adviser and Committee Secretary had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

Comments from HACC members were welcomed to contribute to the discussion.

2. Iain Hope referred to paragraph 4, on the aviation agreements reached by the two parties in the Coalition Government's discussions.
 - the cancellation of the third runway at Heathrow
 - the refusal of additional runways at Gatwick and Stansted
 - the establishment of a high-speed rail network
 - the replacement of the Air Passenger Duty with a per flight duty

On point 1, the LCCI were disappointed and concerned on this.

On point 2, the LCCI were also concerned at this decision.

On point 3, the LCCI were concerned at the problem of the down-grading of the Gatwick Express service.

On point 4, the LCCI had tried to raise this matter with the Treasury, but as of last week, they were unable to provide an answer. They were still trying to discuss this with the Minister to establish a party line to take.

This issue would have an effect on the business traffic going out, and people who were already hard-pressed financially.

3. Margaret Majumdar referred to paragraphs 87-91, relevant to the ANASE Study (Attitudes to Noise from Aircraft Sources in England). It was pleasing to note that there would be discussions arising from ANASE and work was ongoing. It was hoped that the Committee would be kept fully up-to-date on the matter.

It would be useful to declare at the UKACCS meeting, that the residents needed to have the findings of ANASE taken into account when the noise limits were set around the airport.

4. Virginia Godfrey echoed these sentiments and wished to register the profound sense of relief of members of HACAN/Clearskies that the third runway proposal had been rejected by the new Government.
5. John Gurney reiterated that the cancellation of the third runway would be bad for the economy of UK PLC, and it would cause a threat to jobs, in addition to increased traffic on the roads.
6. Cllr. Beer said that he strongly supported the comment made regarding ANASE, as one of Rob Gibson's deputies on LAANC, which represented approximately thirty Councils. They were very keen to promote ANASE. Airports should not be operating under standards which were adopted thirty years ago. In order for the aviation industry to get on well with the community living on the ground around it, the good points of ANASE must be resurrected to go forward.

7. Isobel Knox commented that it should be remembered that there was previously a problem with ANASE. It was not a simple matter of resurrecting the study.

4363 PRESERVATION OF SLOTS FOR DOMESTIC SERVICES AT LONDON AIRPORTS

1. This paper and its Appendices (Item 4) prepared for the UK Airport Consultative Committees Annual Meeting to be held on 3rd June 2010, which would be attended by the Chairman, HACC Adviser and Committee Secretary had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

Comments from HACC members were welcomed to contribute to the discussion.

2. Andy Hull commented that Schipol Airport had 23 slots. With the cancellation of the third runway, Heathrow would lose out to Schipol and other European airports.
3. Iain Hope referred to the application of the air passenger tax. It would appear from some of the commentary available, in this respect, it would be cheaper for British residents tax-wise to travel to Schipol to board long-distance international flights, rather than travel from Heathrow.
4. Andy Hull agreed that this was already the case, as people who wished to travel to destinations such as South Africa were going to Humberside and taking onward flights from Schipol.
5. Isobel Knox agreed that this would happen as a result of the tax driving people away from London airports. It was not thought that the Government meant to do this in their decision process.
6. Susan Parsons said that only if a passenger took two completely separate carriers, would they pay less tax, e.g. a low-cost carrier to Schipol and then a long-haul carrier such as KLM. With a through ticket on KLM, a passenger would pay as much as if they had gone directly from London Heathrow on British Airways or Virgin.

It was inevitable that the taxes would increase once again, particularly with the Emissions Trading Scheme for 2012, where the actual taxes would basically rise for inefficiencies in aircraft and also for distance, which it was thought would be agreed was a much better system.

Hopefully, this would encourage the airlines to invest in quieter, more efficient aircraft.

7. Rob Gibson stated that from a local perspective, the residents did not want aeroplanes flying over the Boroughs. The need for flexibility was appreciated, but in relation to higher taxes, this would be seen as a benefit.

4364 IMPROVING SURFACE ACCESS TO AIRPORTS INCLUDING HIGH SPEED RAIL AND THE TRANSPORT PLAN FOR THE OLYMPICS

1. This paper and its Appendices (Item 5) prepared for the UK Airport Consultative Committees Annual Meeting to be held on 3rd June 2010, which would be attended by the Chairman, HACC Adviser and Committee Secretary had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

Comments from HACC members were welcomed to contribute to the discussion.

2. Murad Qureshi congratulated Paula Street on the paper and Appendices that she had written.

He raised two points from the paper. Firstly, that car parking was abysmal at many airports. Given that securing the finances for huge investment on surface transport provision was difficult, it may be of benefit to encourage BAA to reduce car parking prices.

Secondly, on the Annex it was noted that for Heathrow, an area of concern was a marked drop off in bus and coach use during Q4 2009.

This may be a subject that needed to be ring-fenced for discussion.

3. The Chairman asked if the PSSC had recently received bus and coach usage figures.

John Gurney responded that they had not, but he thought that the drop in patronage could be attributed to the snow in the early part of the year and the volcanic ash, when less people were using transport to the airport.

4. Iain Hope referred to paragraph 33, relevant to the rolling stock of Network Rail. He said that the previous Government had intended to award a contract to Hitachi to replace the Intercity rolling stock. This was of direct importance to Heathrow, as the rolling stock on the West Country Mainline (from Paddington to the West Country and South Wales) was long overdue for replacement, as it was approximately 45 years old. Hitachi had planned to build a factory in this country and employ local people to build the new trains. However, Hitachi have now stated that this had been put on hold or even cancelled by the new Coalition Government. They were re-evaluating as to whether they could now go ahead with the building of the factory or the project.

This was a serious matter, if it was necessary to continue to use 45 year old rolling stock, for which traffic was passing through Heathrow to the West Country and when everyone wished to improve the quality of surface transport by public access.

5. John Gurney pointed out that facilities had to be considered for those parking at the airport, participating in the car share scheme.
6. Simon Baugh responded to the points raised by Murad Qureshi. He said that BAA were regulated by the Civil Aviation Authority on car parking charges, who decided on the appropriate return for BAA. It was not thought that ring-fencing car parking charges was appropriate, but to make sure that a proper surface access strategy was in place, which looked to achieve schemes, as BAA had done, to reduce car usage and get people to travel to the airport in an alternative way.
7. Isobel Knox commented that she was surprised to note that the paper contained little information on Air Track, as this scheme would improve surface access transport to the airport for passengers.

4365 REFORM OF THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE ECONOMIC REGULATION OF AIRPORTS

1. This paper and its Appendices (Item 6) prepared for the UK Airport Consultative Committees Annual Meeting to be held on 3rd June 2010, which would be attended by the Chairman, HACC Adviser and Committee Secretary had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

Comments from HACC members were welcomed to contribute to the discussion.

2. Isobel Knox stated that the previous Government had launched a consultation on this subject and it was hoped the new Government would re-address the matter.

With regard to the decision that Passenger Focus was the most appropriate body to represent air passengers in relation to airport and airline issues, this was a questionable move.

3. The Chairman stated that the subject of Passenger Focus had been re-visited for discussion by the Committee on a number of occasions. It was felt that it would be wise to await the outcome that emerged from the new Coalition Government.

4366 AVIATION SECURITY UPDATE – INCLUDING THE CURRENT BODY SCANNERS CONSULTATION

1. This paper and its Appendices (Item 7) prepared for the UK Airport Consultative Committees Annual Meeting to be held on 3rd June 2010, which would be attended by the Chairman, HACC Adviser and Committee Secretary had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted

Comments from HACC members were welcomed to contribute to the discussion.

2. Andy Hull advised that the PSSC had received a presentation on the body scanners at the meeting on the morning of 2nd June 2010. A response would be composed to the DfT Body Scanners Code of Practice consultation by 21st June 2010 on behalf of the Committee.

Questions had been raised surrounding the knowledge of the gender of staff operating the scanners from behind the scenes (same sex), the appropriate scanning of children and the courtesy of security staff.

4367 PROPOSALS FOR RUNWAY 3 AT HEATHROW

1. This letter which had been circulated to the Committee Members and noted had been submitted by Rob Gibson, LAANC representative relevant to the discussion at the 31st March 2010 meeting, where BAA had outlined their interpretation of the judicial review which had taken place between the London Borough of Hillingdon and others versus the Department for Transport

This matter had been covered by the Chairman under Minute 4358.

4368 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 31st March 2010 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Andy Hull reported that new members to the Committee representing BAA had attended the PSSC meeting on the morning of 2nd June 2010.

It had been suggested by BAA that the work undertaken by the members of the Terminal Monitoring Exercise should be re-evaluated and a discussion on the 'PSSC Going Forward' had also taken place.

4369 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE

1. Report from Heathrow Flight Evaluation Team for the period of Season Winter 2009 (October 2009-March 2010) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Margaret Majumdar referred to Column 25 of the Movements and Quota Summary Report Wks No. 8, 9 and 11. It was assumed that the large number of late departures were due to the inclement weather.

The Committee had been promised some time ago that when extraordinary figures were released, an explanatory text would be included in the report. However, this had been omitted.

It should also be recorded that there were 'people living underneath' these delays and that the number of 148 departures after 11.30 p.m. (an average of 20 per night) was detrimental on people if sleep was disturbed, and therefore their performance at work over the following day(s) would be affected. This needed to be recognised by BAA.

3. The Chairman did recall that BAA had undertaken to provide a summary advising the members, when an unusually large number of late departures had occurred.

Simon Baugh undertook to action this for future reports.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

4. Cllr. Beer reported that he had recently noted there were an increased number of incoming flights on easterlies in the Windsor area at approximately 1.30 a.m. when people were asleep. To be awoken at that time was not acceptable. He asked if this increased activity could be investigated.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

5. Isobel Knox stated that there had been much disruption and delays to flights due to the situation on the volcanic ash. This could well have attributed to the situation.

4370 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report and Borough Noise Line Figures for Quarter 1 (January-March 2010) and LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for Quarter 1 (January-March 2010) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4371 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for March, April and May 2010 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4372 NEWS RELEASES

1. New Releases had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4373 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. There were no further items to discuss and the Chairman closed the meeting at 4.05 p.m.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:-
WEDNESDAY 4th AUGUST 2010**