

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 28th September 2011 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Philip Carlisle, HACC Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Dominic Gilham	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Mohinder Gill (Deputy)	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Martin Elengorn (Deputy)	-	LB Richmond upon Thames
Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy)	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Moreton Moore	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Balvinder Bains	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Marian Rough	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Spencer Taylor	-	Spelthorne BC
Steve Renshaw (Deputy)	-	Surrey CC
Murad Qureshi	-	London Assembly
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Mark Gardiner	-	IATA
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
John Gurney	-	TUC
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Ian Ramsay	-	Independent
Richard Taylor	-	Independent

OTHER

Tim May	-	DfT
---------	---	-----

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Normand Boivin	-	BAA Chief Operating Officer
Nigel Milton	-	BAA Director of Aviation Policy and Political Relations
Ruben Sicking	-	BAA Director of Airside Operations
Dave Whittington	-	BAA Head of Airside Operations
Jane Dawes	-	BAA Operational Noise & Air Quality Manager
Cheryl Monk	-	BAA Head of Community Relations & Policy
Rachael Henry	-	BAA Strategic Communications

PRESENTERS

Jonathan Mitchell - DfT
Simon Earles - BAA
Philip Langsdale - BAA

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

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

Cllr. Chris Turrell (Bracknell Forest BC), Cllr. Barbara Reid (LB Hounslow),
Cllr. Dev Dhillon (South Bucks DC), Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed (LB Hillingdon),
Cllr. Mohammed Kausar (LB Ealing), Cllr. Ian Lake & Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos
(Surrey CC), Susan Laurie (Independent).

2. For those members who had registered an interest, a trip on the Heathrow Pod
(Personal Rapid Transit System) took place prior to the meeting commencing at 2.00 p.m.

4503 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 27th July 2011 were agreed as an accurate record.
2. **(Secretary's Note):** Prior to the meeting, Iain Hope had requested that against Minute 4488, DfT Scoping Document it was recorded that the London Chamber of Commerce supported the High Speed Rail Link 2.

4504 MATTERS ARISING

(a) Minute 4485 - Provide update on transport arrangements in West London during Olympics 2012 (Terry Morgan).

1. Nigel Milton advised that BAA were arranging for TfL to give a presentation on surface access arrangements at Heathrow during the Olympics in 2012, as they were leading on this subject. He would liaise with the Secretary as to at which future HACC meeting this would take place.

ACTION:
NIGEL
MILTON

(b) Minute 4486 - Establish if during TEAM trials will the works be carried out to repairs on sound barrier to Stanwell Moor (Jane Dawes).

1. Jane Dawes confirmed that the Stanwell Moor noise barrier was erected in approximately 2004-2005. She had spoken with the BAA Development Team and there was currently no repairs or maintenance planned to this barrier. However, it was thought that the recent consultations that had taken place in relation to Heathrow's Noise Schemes had included the discussion on a noise barrier in the Longford area; possibly, the query in relation to maintenance adjustment work on the Stanwell Moor noise barrier had been confused with this consultation.

(c) Minute 4486 - Provide definition/criteria of TEAM and TED (Jane Dawes).

1. This matter had been actioned.

(d) Minute 4486 - Establish if during TEAM trials an analysis study is undertaken, could residents living under flight paths surrounding Heathrow be included in the objective survey (Terry Morgan to discuss with CAA).

1. This was covered under Agenda Item 5 – Heathrow Management Matters.

(e) Minute 4486 - Establish if TEAM/TED/mixed-mode clarification information could be sent to local residents (Terry Morgan to discuss with CAA).

1. This was covered under Agenda Item 5 – Heathrow Management Matters.

(f) Minute 4486 - Establish when a surface access review will be made and if LB Hillingdon could be included in the monitoring process (Terry Morgan to discuss with CAA). (Rupesh Mehta also undertook to discuss with DfT).

1. Nigel Milton advised that Heathrow was currently developing a disabled travel plan up until the end of the decade, in partnership with the Heathrow Area Transport Forum (HATF). Hillingdon were already a member of this Forum, with Mr. Bob Cassidy, who is part of this team, as their representative.

The group were currently discussing the objectives of the disabled travel plan with the Board members.

(g) Minute 4498 - Establish future plans for former catering base on Scylla Road (South side of the airport) (Terry Morgan).

1. Nigel Milton advised that the former Gate Gourmet site was vacated and was now owned by the Airport Property Partnership. This is a joint venture between Arriva and the property company. They were currently demolishing the current building and plan to construct new warehouse facilities.

They had detailed planning permission for half of the site and were awaiting planning permission for the other half of the site. Construction was due next year.

(h) Minute 4499 - Check database for 'HACC Complaints by Borough' Report as certain District Councils entered as Borough Councils. *Runnymede and Spelthorne are Borough Councils not District Councils. Slough is a Borough Council. Windsor & Maidenhead is a Royal Borough.

1. This had been actioned.

4505 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

1. HACC Website

Philip Carlisle advised that the company who were currently responsible for servicing and maintaining the HACC website, were changing its business as at 1st August 2012. A replacement company had been identified to take over the service and BAA had already authorised a minor expenditure in translating the hosting and maintenance of the site from its current supplier.

It was proposed that once the new company was on board, with the transition starting as at June/July of next year, to be ready for the beginning of August, a quote could be looked at for any necessary upgrading of the site, particularly in relation to carrying many more documents on the site than currently. Also, if necessary, a security password protected area of the site, for documents which were confidential to the Committee and not available to the general public.

It was hoped, that by this time next year, a site would be running that everybody could use in the way that they wished to.

4506 HEATHROW MANAGEMENT MATTERS

1. (a) Dialogue with Mr. Normand Boivin, Chief Operating Officer of Heathrow Airport.
(b) BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman welcomed Mr. Normand Boivin, BAA Chief Operating Officer and Mr. Ruben Sicking, BAA Airside Operations Director to their first meeting of HACC in their newly appointed roles.
3. Mr. Boivin presented his Heathrow Update report with Nigel Milton.

Mr. Boivin explained that he had been appointed to BAA four weeks earlier. He was previously the Chief Operating Officer at Montreal Airport in Canada for the past eleven years. His mandate for Heathrow was to focus the operation on passenger service and centre on how the business operation could improve to 'make every journey better'.

The object was to improve the passenger service and the service to the carriers, so that they in turn would provide a better service to the passenger.

Following the snow event of last year at Heathrow, there was work to be undertaken with Ruben Sicking, who also originated from a snow country and knew about the subject. The topic of winter resilience had been worked on during the last few months by BAA and they were confident that the coming season would be good, although it was necessary to continually practice and rehearse the processes that had been put in place to clear snow. It could not be said that snow would never close the airport again, but unless there were safety concerns, BAA should be able to run the airport this coming winter and those in the future.

The Olympics would arrive in 2012. BAA had a plan and a team working in readiness, so that the passengers would receive a good experience travelling to and from London next year.

Another mandate to focus on was to spend more time with the UK Border Agency, in order to find ways to improve this passenger process facility at the border.

4. Iain Hope raised two points. Firstly, in regard to the security issue and the improvements in throughput.

In the changing check-in situation, it was thought that the airport was moving away from the age of check-in desks and long queues of passengers, but what was needed was long rows of security officers at Heathrow, to get passengers through as quickly as possible.

It was appreciated that the configuration of the terminals was a long-term project to alter, but it was an issue that was discussed by travellers at the London Chamber of Commerce the previous week at a luncheon, as still being a bind.

Secondly, in regard to the Olympics and VIPs. Some years ago, Mrs. Janis Kong, former BAA Executive Chairman, was faced with a serious problem when President George Bush first visited the UK, when he decided he wished to arrive at Heathrow for a State visit with seven Jumbos. He was told that this was not possible and reluctantly accepted two Jumbos landing at Heathrow with the remainder travelling to Stansted.

A further problem was experienced by BAA and Air Traffic Control when the President decided to leave from Buckingham Palace to encounter a 25-minute personal flight in a helicopter for sight-seeing around London.

With the diplomacy of VIPs and their issues, this was important, but the point was made that there was back-history at Heathrow.

5. Cllr. Beer stated that no mention was made of the local communities and their concerns in the mandates to cover, although it was assumed this would be taken on board, which would be welcomed.

Heathrow Airport did not sit very well with many of the local communities because of its noise and pollution. It was hoped that this would be a major activity on the BAA agenda.

6. Susan Parsons stated that the Olympic and Paralympic 2012 period would be very busy for Heathrow. It had been mentioned that there would be a temporary facility to handle many of the athletes. ABTA wished to ensure that it would be business as usual for all of the other passengers and asked for assurance on this.

Normand Boivin responded that the temporary facility was to allow BAA to continue with 'business as usual' in the terminals and get the extra crowd out in the process, by which they will be segregated from the regular business.

It was correct to say that BAA would be unable to take care of 'business as usual' in this way. It was a concern shared by the airlines and BAA.

BAA wished to upgrade the airport, or at least the facility, as soon as possible during the Olympics for a smooth transition. The day after the closing ceremony, all of the athletes would be departing on the same day, some with as many as seven bags or more per person.

This extra demand had to be taken and put elsewhere, so that the terminals could operate in the normal way, as they did on a regular basis.

7. Nigel Milton outlined information on the Operational Freedoms trial, which was of interest to the Committee Members and their colleagues.

The South-East Airports Taskforce (SEAT) concluded that there would be a three-prong approach to improving the delays, punctuality and resilience at Heathrow Airport. One of the methods would be through capacity management, a second through the introduction of a Performance Charter and a third by the trial of Operational Freedoms.

The CAA and the DfT had agreed the parameters and safeguards of the trial. The trial would commence on 1st November 2011 and run for four months until 29th February 2012. There would then be a four-month gap for assessment, engagement and adjustment. The second phase of the trial would commence on 1st July 2012 and would run until 30th September 2012.

The trial would build on current measures that were already used at Heathrow to deal with periods of disruption.

During the first phase of the trial between 1st November 2011 to 29th February 2012, the CAA and DfT had agreed that BAA, the airlines and NATS could use the following three procedures, but they would be tested to explore their impacts.

The use of dual departures. This meant that departures were operated from the runway that was designated for arrivals. This particular process was not currently used at Heathrow.

The use of dual arrivals. This meant that arrivals would land on the runway designated for departures. This measure is currently used at Heathrow through the application of TEAM (Tactically Enhanced Arrivals Mode). This would be extended to meet the objectives of the trial.

The third procedure would be using either dual departures or dual arrivals. Benefits could possibly be derived, by landing A380s closest to their parking stand or operating Terminal 4 traffic on the Southern runway, or landing small and light aircraft away from the main stream of aircraft traffic.

The measures would be used during both easterly and westerly operations. Departures from the Northern runway and arrivals from the Southern runway in the easterly direction will be included in the trials.

As yet, it was not known under what circumstances these procedures would be used and how often. That was part of the purpose of the trial. However, dual arrivals and dual departures would only be used on a limited basis and never used together.

The CAA have recommended, and the DfT have agreed, that one or more of the following conditions would have to be met before the operational freedoms procedures could be used by NATS, BAA or the airlines:

1. The anticipated arrival delay or departure delay is 10 minutes or more;
2. The headwind component on approach to Heathrow is forecast to be greater than 20 knots at 3,000 ft.;
3. The arrival or departure flight schedule is anticipated to run later than 30 minutes, or 30% of flights are running outside of the 15 minutes punctuality target;
4. Following a period of disruption to recover the operation such as snow.

The use of procedures will be subject to the judgement and discretion of Air Traffic Control.

During the trial, a number of proactive tests, still using the same measures, will be used to explore the passenger, environmental and operational benefits. In the first phase of the trial, these tests will be used in two four-week periods, the dates of which will be communicated in advance of the trial starting on 1st November 2011.

These proactive tests are:

Landing Airbus A380 aircraft on the runway closest to their destination stand;
Landing small aircraft on the designated departures runway;
Use of the Southern runway for Terminal 4 arrivals and departures to prevent temporary closure of the Southern runway.

A review of the first phase of the trial will be conducted once the first phase finishes at the end of February over a period of three months. Discussion with the DfT, CAA, and local stakeholders will commence before agreeing the terms under which the second phase of the trial will operate next Summer.

The DfT have approved the engagement plan that BAA had drafted to communicate the details of the trial to the affected communities. A leaflet will be distributed to 150,000 homes in West London and to the west of the airport over the weekend of 8th/9th October 2011. Advertisements will be published in newspapers on 10th October 2011, and again, when the first stage of the trial commences.

BAA were seeking local authority input as to how the trial will be monitored and how the data gathered will be shared with interested parties. A letter had been sent to the Chief Executives of fourteen local Councils, inviting them to send representation to a meeting on Wednesday 12th October 2011, at which those issues and other concerns will be discussed on the planned trial.

The key message is that the use of operational freedoms will not result in additional flights into Heathrow. There will be no increase in the number of scheduled night movements nor in the hourly scheduled capacity of the airport during the trial.

It was only a trial. There was no confirmation or expectation that the terms under which the industry was being allowed to use these procedures during the trial would be confirmed for permanent use, but the trial would enable BAA, NATS, airlines, CAA and DfT to establish what the impacts of these procedures were on the local community, on passengers and to the environment.

Finally, before any final decision was made on the permanent use of the procedures at Heathrow, a formal consultation with the communities affected and other stakeholders would take place following the end of the second phase of the trial in 2012.

8. Keith Harlow asked if it was known during what proportion of operational hours, one or more of those parameters will be met.

Nigel Milton responded that this was not known. If there is a ten-minute delay, going up, if one of the procedures was used, that delay would cease. One of the reasons for the trial was to see what the effect would be.

9. Virginia Godfrey stated that, as was already known, communities were extremely concerned at the forthcoming trial, as alternation was sacrosanct and absolutely vital respite for all the residents surrounding Heathrow.

It was not understood as to what could be done with regard to the ten-minute delay. Would this involve the use of the procedure of either TEAM or TED and what did the limited basis mean.

Nigel Milton clarified that Heathrow did suffer from delays. The trial would seek to establish if it was possible to intervene by the use of TEAM or TED, and the extent to which those delays could easily be resolved.

As to the question of how often this would occur, this was not known. This was the purpose of the trial. It was thought that infrequent, but timely use of the appropriate procedures would mean that delays at Heathrow would be significantly reduced.

10. Rob Gibson stated that he was very disappointed that this reporting was the first that had been heard about the operational freedoms trial, even though it was some considerable time since the Minister had made the announcement. The Local Authorities have had no contact with either BAA or the CAA with regard to this matter.

Questions were raised at the recent Noise & Track Keeping Working Group (NTKWG) meeting but no response had been received from BAA.

It would seem that many decisions had already been made in relation to the trial, without consultation. It was presumed that those decisions were not open to debate. This was of concern, as it was the view that this was not active engagement with the local communities.

Finally, given the timing of the trial, it was assumed that there was no intention to conduct a social survey researching amongst the community on the effect of the trials, as there would be insufficient time.

Nigel Milton replied that he noted the first two points as statements, but as to the third point, there was still sufficient time to conduct a social survey.

11. John Gurney stated that one problem previously experienced was congestion on the tarmac. He asked that, if the procedure was to be conducted every ten-minutes, would the air quality data be captured on the airport, as if the fumes were eradicated, the air quality should be much improved.

Nigel Milton responded that the collective data and how this was analysed would be determined. Now that the trial framework had been established, it would be possible for BAA to liaise with the local authorities and communities to ascertain the data that it was necessary to collect from the airlines and NATS and the effect the procedures used in the trial would have on air quality and noise. Both negative and positive impact information would need to be assessed amongst a whole range of issues to decide on the success or otherwise of the procedures.

12. Margaret Majumdar stated that a ten-minute delay equated to approximately five aircraft movements. Therefore, should it be taken that the Northern runway would be used for five movements of the other type and cease, and then there should be a considerable gap.

Also, as no work had yet been carried out on the taxiways at the western end of the Northern runway, how would it be possible to get five aircraft movements onto the runway for take off.

Nigel Milton stated that it was not necessary to undertake additional works on the taxiways at the western end of the Northern runway for the trial. The movements would be in short, sharp bursts.

13. Margaret Majumdar referred to the Traffic Statistics for September 2011, which she said were very useful.

With regard to the 'aircraft out of alternation owing to TEAM' figures, by the January 2012 HACC meeting, the first phase of the operational freedoms trial would be underway. Therefore, would the TED statistics be added to the TEAM statistics and also reported to the Committee.

Nigel Milton responded that during the trial, it was the expectation that the data collected and the extent to which the procedures were being used, would be relayed and made available to those interested. At the January 2012 HACC meeting, it was anticipated that a significant amount of data would be available to share.

14. Margaret Majumdar referred to the late departures after 23.30 hrs. report. It was noted that in August, there had been three flights in the early hours of the morning, in addition to three in September.

It was thought that the aviation industry needed to plan to reduce the number of late departures that disturbed the local communities. It was hoped that, when the next night regime was brought in these would be stopped.

Nigel Milton responded that this message statement was noted and the DfT were also aware of the point made.

(Secretary's Note): The BAA operational freedoms trial information was circulated to the members.. It is also available on the BAA Noise home page:

<http://www.heathrowairport.com/noise>

LHR home page (at the bottom under Heathrow News):

<http://www.heathrowairport.com>

4507 DfT: HIGH SPEED RAIL 2: INVESTING IN BRITAIN'S FUTURE CONSULTATION

1. Presentation by Jonathan Mitchell, DfT High Speed Rail Strategy Manager. (*enclosed*).

The Government believes that high speed rail can play an important role in promoting valuable strategic change in the economic geography of Britain, supporting sustainable long-term growth and reducing regional disparities. It considers that there is a strong strategic case for linking a UK high speed rail network to the country's major international gateways and, for Heathrow, this would have important strategic advantages.

For this reason, the Government commissioned HS2 Ltd in June 2010, to provide advice on the options for direct links to Heathrow and to the High Speed 1 line to the Channel Tunnel, together with a report on the comparative case for different ways of connecting the West Midlands, Manchester and Leeds. This work would inform the Government's overall strategy and timetable for establishing a high speed rail network.

On 28th February 2011, the Secretary of State launched the consultation on the Government's proposed High Speed Rail Strategy and the recommended route for an initial high speed line from London to the West Midlands.

2. Iain Hope stated that the London Chamber of Commerce were strong supporters of the high speed links. However, they were concerned at any delays in the Heathrow loop. There were issues on the routing of that loop. However, it was felt that it should not be delayed until the later phases of the whole network, in order to get passengers off the roads travelling to Heathrow.

Concern about Old Oak Common was also shown by the LCCI, as it was not felt to be a suitable terminus. It was believed that more suitable options were Euston and the City Centre. The area of Old Oak Common was too far out to travel.

Jonathan Mitchell clarified that the Government were proposing both an interchange station at Old Oak Common, so that passengers could alight from the High Speed 2 train onto Crossrail, and a terminus station at Euston, Central London. Those two were both fundamentals to the project and it was not possible to have one without the other.

3. Cllr. Gilham asked for clarification that it has been stated that the noise impact from High Speed Rail 2 would only affect ten homes on the route. He asked how this could be possible, as homes across the whole of the London Borough of Hillingdon would be impacted by noise.

Jonathan Mitchell clarified that ten homes across the route would be affected by 'severe' noise. These were World Health Organisation (WHO) definitions which meant that the home was likely to be inhabitable. Over a route of an 140 mile railway, that figure was low. There would be other noise impacts on the railway line and a detailed noise assessment would be published. The noise impacts were considerably less than the noise that the airport runways tend to give rise to.

Much noise assessment had been done to date, with more to follow. Looking specifically at the Ruislip Corridor, the DfT HS2 noise assessment is that the level of noise experienced by residents in that area, once HS2 is in operation, could well be less than it is today. This was due to noise mitigation works that would have been put in place to reduce existing railway noise.

4. Murad Qureshi referred to the debate on aviation capacity. He asked to what extent this had been considered so far. The travelling time of 49 minutes to Birmingham had been quoted and also if it was the intention to encourage people to travel from Central London to Birmingham for connections of flights rather than Heathrow.

Jonathan Mitchell responded that High Speed Rail 2 would give rise to a number of opportunities. The project was at a very early stage, with much further work to complete, to explore with the aviation sector how HS2 might integrate. Reduced journey times to Birmingham and Manchester Airports would open up these opportunities and the DfT wished to enter into a dialogue over the coming years as to how to get the best balance of benefits from the scheme.

Murad Qureshi stated that with the experience so far with the HS2 proposals survey routed into Central London, only one option was presented to Londoners. It was hoped that when the time came to consider Heathrow, a variety of options would be offered, rather than just one.

Jonathan Mitchell advised that the view had been taken that the most responsible approach was for the Government to choose a favoured route and set of stations, rather than publishing a whole raft of routes and station options and putting this out to consultation.

The reason that the DfT approach was responsible and the latter irresponsible related to the issue of planning blight. If the Government offered many different routes which could be followed and many stations could be built, as was the experience with High Speed Rail 1 in Kent, there was very great concern generated and property values hit.

The Government took the view that it should look at all of the options and receive the best possible advice and then set out its favoured option. In setting out that option of Euston station for Central London, the DfT had also published all of the other options which were discounted with the reasons why. Consultees were invited to comment on that analysis, to point out any deficiencies. At that stage no decision had been made. However, the Government had felt that the responsible approach to take was to set out a proposal, rather than spreading blight across large areas of southern England.

Murad Qureshi commented that he appreciated the HS2 scheme would still not prevent blight on the homes in the Euston area. He asked if by using Old Oak Common that would determine the proposed final route option that would be presented to the public.

Jonathan Mitchell explained, that an interchange station with Crossrail was extremely important, as one high volume railway line inter-acting with another. The Government believed there was a strong case to use Old Oak Common, but remained open to be presented with evidence to the contrary, and that alternative options could offer better return on the Government's investment.

5. Andy Hull stated that the lead-times for the project seemed to be lengthy, compared to the French and Spanish on similar projects. He asked if comparisons were known as to how long it had taken these countries to build a railway.

Jonathan Mitchell advised that the lead-times was dependent on how the project process was managed in a country. In the UK, the opportunity was valued to consult in detail with the public and to scrutinise plans before powers were granted.

The lengthy project lead-times were not due to slow engineer workmanship. It was purely because the UK had a strong approach to consultation and involvement.

6. Cllr. Bains asked if the HS2 routing to Heathrow would link with the areas of Reading, Slough or Windsor.

Jonathan Mitchell responded that to get the best journey times into London, it would be inadvisable to route HS2 that far west.

7. Rob Gibson made an observation that if the Government were investing money to reduce journey times into Central London from Birmingham (by 35 minutes), more might be gained elsewhere, particularly the Piccadilly Line, on which it was understood the upgrade works had been postponed.

Jonathan Mitchell stated that it was not an 'either/or' situation. Currently, the Government were spending £2 billion+ per annum on building Crossrail. That construction phase would end over the course of the next few years. That funding stream would then be transferred to HS2. In addition to Crossrail, there were record levels of investment into upgrading the London transport system. The Government were confident that this would continue to be the case, even when HS2 came on board. High Speed Rail 2 was a project to tackle a specific problem that the UK faced over the next two decades. It did not mean that no further upgrades would be made on the transport system.

4508 WIDER HEATHROW INTEGRATED RAIL STRATEGY (WHIRS)

1. Presentation by Allan Gregory, BAA Surface Access Director and Simon Earles, BAA Head of Surface Access Strategy.

BAA were now working on a new programme called the Wider Heathrow Integrated Rail Strategy (known as WHIRS), which would seek to build on previous investment, by ensuring that Heathrow had fast and frequent rail connections for passengers, whilst at the same time, improving links to the surrounding community to get the local economy moving. The airport would also continue to invest in enhancements to the Heathrow Express service (*enclosed*).

2. Murad Qureshi asked what the present function was for Crossrail with the proposed number of trains into Heathrow, given that there was only meant to be 1% ownership as a result of the huge investment of Crossrail. Network Rail were in agreement that there should be ten trains per hour. This was more than double the current frequency of trains into the airport.

Simon Earles responded that the current schedule was that Crossrail services would commence operation into Heathrow late 2019. The existing Connect service of two trains per hour running from Paddington into the Central Terminal Area and Terminal 4 would be replaced by four Crossrail trains per hour running all the way through to Abbey Wood, with Heathrow Express travelling into Terminal 5, as currently.

Murad Qureshi continued that presentations had previously been received by BAA on Heathrow Express. There was an issue on slots at Paddington Station. He asked if this was a matter that Network Rail had resolved.

Simon Earles clarified that Network Rail had effectively proposed, because of the significant capacity challenge on the Great Western Mainline into Central London, that additional Crossrail trains should be sent west in the peak hours, to address congestion and capacity challenges in the Thames Valley area. However, they had also advocated that they believed, there was scope to increase the number of Crossrail trains travelling into Heathrow.

The proposal from Network Rail would mean that the Crossrail trains would increase from four to ten per hour, but at the expense of the Heathrow Express.

Murad Qureshi also asked for assurance that passenger luggage would be better managed.

Simon Earles stated that, in terms of Crossrail, the rolling stock specification had not been let. It had been currently pushed back. It was a subject that BAA would take a view on, but as a business had to be realistic about what others would expect from Crossrail and what it would look like.

The view of BAA is that if a passenger requires the best experience from an aviation perspective, adequate planning provision had to be made for luggage.

3. Cllr. Moore asked if the AirTrack scheme might be resurrected. In the area of Runnymede, which he represented, there was a problem with level crossings and how long they would be down with trains passing through.

Simon Earles responded that BAA had concluded in the work that the catchments for the South Coast and South London were very important to Heathrow and similarly many employees and businesses relied on Heathrow and would benefit from improved connections.

However, it was accepted that rail solutions should be determined by the rail industry, and that particularly in the South-West main line corridor there were major challenges for Network Rail, who acknowledged this.

4509 DfT UK AVIATION FORECASTS 2011

1. The Department of Transport's report presents their updated forecasts of the UK air passengers and UK aviation CO₂ emissions to 2050. It is part of the response to the Committee on Climate Change (CCC) report on options for reducing CO₂ emissions from UK aviation to 2050.

Please see <http://www.dft.gov.uk/publications/uk-aviation-forecasts-2011/>

The report, should help to inform those considering responding to the Sustainable Aviation Framework Scoping Document before the October 2011 deadline.

(HACC.582) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

The conclusions of an independent peer review of the methods underpinning the updated forecasts, and associated technical notes, appear as supporting documents to the technical report.

4510 DfT SCOPING DOCUMENT ON A SUSTAINABLE FRAMEWORK FOR UK AVIATION

1. The Scoping Document was published by the DfT in March 2011 to address the broad principles of aviation policies. A full six-month consultation had been launched (30th March 2011- 30th September 2011), the results of which it was planned to publish in March 2012.

At the 27th July 2011 meeting, members were requested to send in any further submissions to accompany the comments already provided by the first week in September, for composition into a response.

The final draft had been sent to members in advance of the September meeting for approval (HACC.581).

Suggested amendments were made by the members as follows:-

2. Virginia Godfrey

Point 5.40 – on the second paragraph, the wording of ‘new metrics’ etc. change to ‘Complimentary noise measures are needed that the public can easily understand’.

Cllr. Malcolm Beer

Introduction paragraph, penultimate line, change to ‘generated by aviation and associated activities’.

Point 5.42 – on the second paragraph, change the word ‘idea’ to ‘concept’.

Point 5.43 – first line of paragraph, change to ‘There is a strong view’ that the idea of a noise envelope.....

In relation to Point 5.40, Cllr. Beer also commented, that if there is too great a development in one area e.g. Heathrow, there is ‘overheating of the economy’. Housing becomes a problem for those who wish to live in the area. ‘Over-development’ had a negative impact on the environment, infrastructure and economy. There is also gridlock on the roads. Limitations should be flagged up.

3. The Chairman said that these comments would be considered.

4511 WINTER RESILIENCE

1. Update by Philip Langsdale, BAA Chief Information Officer on the progress of the Winter Resilience project (*enclosed*).

Last December, Heathrow was hit by severe snow. BAA immediately asked BAA Non-Executive Director, Professor David Begg to put together a full report on their operational performance. His team of airport professionals from around the world looked at what happened and how they could respond better.

BAA accepted all 14 proposals for improvements made in his report. As a result, the Heathrow Winter Resilience Programme was created and tackled the proposals through three initiatives: Preparation and Planning, Command and Control, and Passenger Welfare. These would be realised over a period of several years, although obviously the immediate focus was on how to improve the operation in time for the coming winter.

(Secretary’s Note): The BAA Winter Resilience Programme Update – September 2011 was circulated to the members. It is also available on the BAA Website.

2. Cllr. Gilham stated that he understood there was a CCTV equipment system available with use of an iPad and asked if this system was in place.

Philip Langsdale responded that BAA had partially rolled-out CCTV and situational awareness. This would enable passengers to track a real-time status report of stands and, importantly, the snow equipment and how it was clearing.

3. Cllr. Bains referred to the training of BAA staff as ‘Reservists’ who would be deployed into the terminals when extra people were needed during times of a significant event that affected the airport. He asked if the airline staff would also be trained in a similar way. During December 2010, when the snow fell at the airport, the airlines were giving misleading information to the passengers which differed to the information relayed by BAA.

Philip Langsdale replied that BAA had paid much attention to getting consistent messages on the status of aeroplanes to the passengers. It was agreed that previously, confusing messages had been relayed which differed between the airlines and BAA. This had now been aligned so that the airline message, BAA message and website information would be the same. It was hoped, what had been a serious issue would be mitigated from the start.

In terms of airline training. There had been consistently strong support from the airlines, particularly for the passenger and child welfare. It was much easier for the home-based carriers, British Airways, Virgin and bmi to effect that charter, as they had many staff globally. It was harder for smaller airlines who rely perhaps upon a smaller service, to respond to that.

BAA had agreed that if the airlines were able to support the resources on the airfield at the time of the crisis, they would work with them under the guidance of the AOC to help address the needs of the air passengers

4. Brian Yates (Chairman of PSSC) stated that he had represented the Committee at the BAA Winter Resilience stakeholder meetings and Working Groups. There was much work undertaken on the welfare and communication front.

It had been observed there was an intense degree of collaboration between all the stakeholders, who had a spirit that they had to make the programme work and the fact that the attendance at the stakeholder Board meetings continued to be at very high levels from the various organisations.

4512 THE CAA CONSULTATION ON OPTIONS FOR CONSUMER PANEL (PASSENGER REPRESENTATION AND COMPLAINT HANDLING)

1. Following on from the recent CAA work on passenger representation and complaint handling, as part of its Strategic Plan, the CAA had now written proposing four options on how it planned to develop a new approach to consider consumer issues and set up a consumer panel. Views were requested on the options presented. A copy of their letter and the response submitted on behalf of HACC was circulated with the Agenda for information and noted. (*Also for PSSC*).

4513 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 27th July 2011 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Brian Yates, as Chairman of the PSSC stated that there was an ongoing consultation on airport security uniformity.

There was work in progress on the performance of the UK Border Agency.

4514 NTK WORKING GROUP

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 17th May 2011 had not been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4515 AIR QUALITY AT HEATHROW AIRPORT – SEPTEMBER 2011

1. BAA Air Quality Monitoring Report at Heathrow Airport for September 2011 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

(Secretary's Note): This report was re-circulated following a revision.

4516 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Villages Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for July, August and September 2011 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4517 NEWS RELEASES

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

4518 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 7th DECEMBER 2011 (SEMINAR)
HEATHROW ACADEMY**

DATES OF 2012 MEETINGS:

**WEDNESDAY 25th JANUARY 2012
WEDNESDAY 28th MARCH 2012
WEDNESDAY 23rd MAY 2012
WEDNESDAY 25th JULY 2012
WEDNESDAY 26th SEPTEMBER 2012
WEDNESDAY 5th DECEMBER 2012 (SEMINAR)**