

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the business meeting and Seminar held on 29th November 2004 at The Renaissance Hotel, Heathrow

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Mahinder S. Gill (Deputy)	-	LB of Hounslow
Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. David Bishop	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. John Oswell (Deputy)	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Jim Maddan	-	LB Wandsworth
Cllr. Christopher Knight	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. James Maxwell	-	Surrey CC
Cllr. Peter Roberts	-	Bucks CC
Cllr. Gerry Ceaser	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Martine Hyams (Deputy)	-	Spelthorne BC
Peter Viggers	-	EANAG
John Gurney	-	TUC
Tony Lucking	-	AUC
Iain Hope	-	HASG
Roy Featherstone	-	ABTA
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Donald Gregory	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Danny Brown	-	Independent

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Eryl Smith	-	Director of Business Strategy, Planning & Development
Andrew Dryland	-	Director of Planning & Environment
Jon Phillips	-	Director of Communications
Nita Easey	-	Flight Evaluation Communications Manager
Barry Nestler	-	Airside Environmental Strategy Manager

APOLOGIES:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

Janis Kong (BAA Executive Chairman), Gill Kirk (BAA Head of Public Affairs), Philip Carlisle (GBTA), Janet Brady (Independent), Brian Yates (Consumers' Association), Cllr. Margaret Majumdar (LB Ealing), Cllr. Michael Elliott (Deputy) (LB Ealing), Cllr. Mary Ballin (Bracknell Forest BC), Cllr. Digby Jacks (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Mike Cartwright (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr. Charlie Treloggan, (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr. Malcolm Beer (RB of Windsor & Maidenhead), Cllr. Don Lyons-Davis (LAANC), Cllr. Rodney Bennett (LB Richmond upon Thames), Cllr. Denise Grant (Spelthorne BC), Roger Wiltshire (BATA), Paul Ellis (IATA), David Gray (DfT).

2862 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd September 2004 were agreed.

2863 MATTERS ARISING

1. Cllr. Maxwell wished to thank Jon Phillips for his detailed response to Surrey CC in respect of Bedfont Lakes, the contents of which it was hoped would alleviate the problem.
2. Virginia Godfrey raised a question in relation to Minute 2852, Item 9, where Cllr. Maxwell had referred to the BAA Capital Investment Programme for Heathrow 2004 and the forecasts for 2012/13 where the programme was supporting an annual passenger movement of 85.0 million and asked if the forecast included mixed-mode operations at Heathrow and could an estimate be given of what the level of passenger movement might be by 2012/13 if the 480,000 cap was removed.

The Chairman had said that BAA would investigate this and a reply would be reported back to Cllr. Maxwell at a later stage.

Virginia Godfrey wished to know if this response had been received by Cllr. Maxwell.

Cllr. Maxwell confirmed he had not received a response.

Jon Phillips replied that if he understood the point captured in the minutes correctly, the first query was whether the 85.0 million passenger throughput assumed any form of mixed-mode. The answer to this is, no it does not. To the second part of the question, what would be the throughput of flights if the 480,000 cap was removed, BAA do not, at present, have an answer, but as far as they are able to provide one, will endeavour to do so.

The Chairman asked if the best course of action, to ensure that all Members were involved, would be to put this item on the Agenda for the January 2005 HACC meeting.

Jon Phillips agreed.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

2864 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

1. **Committee Membership** – A letter had been received from: the London Chamber of Commerce confirming that Barry Humphreys from Virgin Atlantic Airways Limited had stepped down as the London Chamber's representative on the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee. His replacement is Iain Hope, moving over from the Heathrow Airport Support Group, thus leaving a vacancy. Cllr. Sydney Kallar from the Association of London Government had similarly stepped down from the Committee and we await the announcement of his replacement.
2. The Chairman welcomed Cllr. Nick Brougham from Surrey CC who was attending the HACC meeting to observe the proceedings.

2865 BAA NOISE AND BLIGHT CONSULTATIONS

Presentation by Jon Phillips, BAA Director of Communications (enclosed).

1. The Chairman said that Members should note that the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee had been specifically asked to make a response to these consultation documents.
2. Jon Phillips gave an overview of the Noise and Blight Consultations. He said that the White Paper had thrown a number of challenges at BAA, but there were two in particular. The first was very specific in what BAA was expected to bring forward and the second was slightly less so. The slightly less specific challenge was around the issue of generalised blight.

Jon Phillips read verbatim from the White Paper. "The prospect of airport development will in many cases have a wider impact on property values in the period before any statutory protection would be available. This is often referred to as generalised blight. There is no statutory remedy for this, but we accept that people should have access to some form of redress, for example, to help them relocate before the development takes place, if they need to do so. Arrangements are therefore being made for non-statutory schemes to be brought forward locally by airport operators, to deal with the problem of generalised blight where runways are supported by this White Paper or where land is safe-guarded.

This was the clue that Government gave BAA on generalised blight.

The other instruction was on the matter of noise, where the Government was more specific and had instructed BAA with immediate effect, to bring forward schemes that would offer households that were subject to high levels of noise, i.e. 69 dBA leq contour or more, assistance with the cost of relocating and offer acoustic insulation to other noise sensitive buildings such as schools and hospitals exposed to medium-high levels of noise, i.e. 63 dBA leq contour.

These were the two schemes and hence the publication of the two BAA consultation documents.

The consultation was launched two months ago. It was a three-month consultation. (September-December).

Approximately 12,000 copies had been distributed via the post and BAA had tried their best to advertise the consultation locally by placing advertisements in local newspapers and by directing people to the BAA website and to contact the freephone number, in order to attract the widest possible response. Other language versions of the document had been made available for the local communities, if English was not their first language.

At least one hundred, rather detailed telephone calls from individuals had been dealt with by BAA to discuss the issues of local residents..

The intention is to bring forward the finalised schemes in Spring 2005, once BAA had the chance to digest all the responses to the consultation.

One part that was missing from the proposals at present, was a definitive boundary around which the scheme would take effect. This cannot be provided until BAA had completed the work on the Interim Master Plan. It was a question of trying to place everything in the right order to be able to follow a proper course. The publication of the Interim Master Plan in Spring 2005 could provide the information, if necessary, to state the boundary of the schemes, as seen by BAA.

The land that would be required to be purchased in order to make a third runway area possible, with houses that would need to be demolished was known as the Inner Zone, the area around which the extended airport's boundary would sit.

The first part of the scheme was called the Property Market Support Bond.

The principle behind this was that BAA would provide assurance that they would offer to purchase, once a decision to apply for planning permission by BAA had been announced. That Bond would become transferable for people when they wished to sell their property and move on, in the knowledge that the purchaser would have that Guarantee. BAA would purchase properties at a price index-linked to June 2002, which was pre-White Paper, pre-SERAS consultation, and the nearest BAA could identify as a pre-blight period. To that, a flat 10% would be added, should planning permission be granted.

3. Roy Featherstone asked for a definition of the extended airport boundary.

Jon Phillips responded that it was understood what the current boundary was. If a third runway was added to the north of the existing airport, that would add an extended boundary to the airport. It is the area that would be physically captured to the north of the airport, should the third runway go ahead.

4. Danny Brown asked what indices this had been linked to?

Jon Phillips replied this was the Land Registry Index.

5. Cllr. Ceaser suggested the use of the Nationwide or Halifax Building Societies' indices as opposed to the Land Registry.

Jon Phillips said that BAA were happy to use the most definitive indices available, but had been advised that the Land Registry had the authoritative position on this. However, BAA were open-minded on this aspect and wanted to get the best, most authoritative scheme. It was suggested that if Cllr. Ceaser intended to respond to the consultation, this suggestion made in writing would be helpful.

6. Jon Phillips reported that the second part of the scheme was called the Homeowners Support Scheme. This was different in that this affected the people whose property was not physically required in order to make the third runway possible, but they lived close enough to the new boundary to be potentially, significantly affected e.g. some houses in Cranford and Hounslow which would not be needed in terms of the physical make-up of the airport, but where some deterioration in property values would occur and this scheme was trying to address that particular issue. The 66 dBA leq noise contour would be taken as the likely boundary for this new scheme. The idea behind this, was that once BAA had taken a decision to proceed with a planning application for another runway, then they would be prepared to offer guaranteed purchase of properties in that zone, once approval had been received for the third runway.

However, because of the time that it could physically take to get from the point where BAA had declared the intention to submit a planning application to ultimately receiving permission or not, BAA were conscious that there might be some people caught in a trap in that period of time and hence the scheme had been elaborated upon in a couple of ways with the 'Early Movers Assurance'. This would mean that if a resident were caught in that period and there was proof that their house had fallen by 15% or more in value, BAA would be prepared to assist people in the cost of relocation. However, if the property had fallen less than 15%, BAA would be prepared to assist people with only some form of contribution towards the cost of moving.

7. Peter Viggers asked if the 2002 index-linked price was before or after the addition of the 10%?

Jon Phillips replied that the 10% referred to the first scheme only. Only up to a maximum of 5% of the sale price would be offered as a contribution.

8. Don Gregory said it was presumed that there was already some blight on the properties in the local community.

Jon Phillips said that this was debatable at present. It was for this reason that BAA had to be careful and the choice of the index was crucial, and it must be understood what was happening in the live property market. In the Press it was undoubtedly suggested that there was an overall cooling down of property values. In the vicinity, how much of that was attributable to what was happening in the market generally and how much was specific to this particular issue of the third runway was not clear. The index will make that clear.

The above two schemes as outlined, referred to the generalised concern in the Blight consultation.

9. Mr. Phillips covered the Noise consultation and impacts on today's airport..

Again, there were two schemes. How BAA would address noise sensitive buildings in the 63 dBA leq noise contour, and how assistance would be given to people who chose to relocate in the 69 dBA leq noise contour.

The first glance across this would indicate that there were no hospitals in the 63 dBA leq 2002 noise contour for Heathrow. It should be borne in mind that these were schemes that had to apply across all of the BAA airports. For Heathrow at present, the prediction was that there were 40 schools that will fall within this particular noise contour and possibly some hospices. It was the proposition of BAA to provide 100% of the cost of secondary glazing or noise insulation, whichever was the most appropriate.

Judgement needed to be exercised as to what was the sensible use of funding e.g. if half of a school's teaching facilities was made up from prefab huts, it would not be money well spent to put it towards noise insulation. Flexibility was needed to ascertain a sensible way to help that particular school with the noise impact and hence the quiet learning schemes.

It was hoped that good quality responses were received to the consultation, as BAA need people to help them to design the correct scheme.

10. Peter Viggers asked if noise insulation only applied to secondary glazing of the windows?

Jon Phillips replied that BAA had been working with several schools in the worst affected areas in Hounslow during the past year and had attained a reasonable level of expertise, together with Everest the supplier, at what was a sensible attempt to try and make improvements. Judgement had to be made on the overall ability to reduce the noise impact within a learning environment and that would include the state of the roof, walls, windows etc. and establish a picture of what improvements it would be hoped, could be made in those areas.

11. Cllr. Knight asked if the noise insulation scheme included Day Centres?

Jon Phillips replied that this was not covered in the scope of the scheme upon which BAA were consulting, but invited that this point be included in a response to the consultation.

12. Cllr. Maxwell asked why the noise insulation scheme did not include Public Libraries or Places of Worship?

Jon Phillips again, suggested that this point be included in a response to the consultation.

It could be considered that in regard to Places of Worship, generally, they might only be used once a week, whereas a school was used five days per week. That would be one criteria in terms of how available funding would be allocated.

13. Jon Phillips said in relation to relocation assistance, this scheme was focused on residents who lived within the 69 dBA leq noise contour. That was the same noise contour as BAA currently based their existing noise insulation scheme around. For people who may wish to move and were struggling to sell their property, BAA would step in and provide support in a potential package of a limit of £10,000 per household made up of 1.5% of the open market value, plus a lump sum of £2,500. Within that, a resident would be required to find an alternative property that was in a less noisy area, but one they did not currently occupy.

14. Cllr. Gill asked what would be the position of disabled and retired residents living in the vicinity who did not have the means of funding to relocate due to limited income? He did not believe the relocation package of £10,000 that would be offered was monetarily sufficient.

Jon Phillips replied that if a resident wished to leave the vicinity, and was currently unable to for financial reasons, BAA would offer assistance in a package of up to £10,000 in this respect. However, if this was believed to be insufficient funding, it should be stated in the response to consultation.

15. Cllr Maxwell said following on from the previous comment, his view was that a figure of 1.5% of the open market value, plus a lump sum of £2,500 would barely cover the expense of relocation as this was rising e.g. removal costs, legal fees. For an old person or one on a fixed income, that was a lot of money.
16. Cllr. Roberts asked in relation to the protection of listed buildings, was there a clause to cover this and if a building was in the path of the proposed third runway, how would BAA get round this in relation to blight.

Jon Phillips said that no additional protection was planned as a result of the consultation, over and above that which existed and in place today. If it were a case that there was a listed building within the areas that was needed to build the third runway, then that would form part of the planning application and BAA would have to plead very special circumstances and show that there was absolutely no alternative, other than to remove that building. This issue was highlighted when the SERAS consultation was originally published and there was particular concern shown toward the Tithe Barn in Harmondsworth and the Church very close to it. It remained to be seen whether a boundary could be drawn up by BAA for the new scheme, to avoid the demolition of these two listed buildings.

17. Cllr. Khursheed asked if a response to the consultation had been received from many local authorities.

Jon Phillips replied that a study had not yet been undertaken as to who had actually responded. In terms of numbers, several hundred responses had been received to date.

18. Virginia Godfrey referred to page 10 of the Blight Scheme consultation where it had been stated under paragraph 4 'When would the scheme start?' '*then residents will have been displaced and BAA will have incurred considerable costs unnecessarily*'. It was stressed that it was the unfortunate residents who would incur specific costs upon relocation and they should not have to do so. It was believed that the whole tenure of the consultation was that of BAA should not incur costs.

Jon Phillips took exception to that suggestion. One sentence had been picked up out of the consultation, the wording of which was to illustrate the point that was made by local residents to BAA time and time again, the fact being that some people do not even wish

this scheme to even be discussed, as they were concerned that this was a self-fulfilling prophecy and did not wish to invite potential disruption

In fact, all BAA were trying to do was to be honest and state that they would not get into a scheme that started to purchase the property of residents until there was a level of certainty in the minds of BAA at least, that there was a reasonable chance of success for the scheme.

There were two reasons for this, firstly, not to disrupt communities unnecessarily and secondly, for BAA not to have to pick up a bill for relocating people, only to find out a few years later, the scheme was deemed to have no chance of success. It was believed this was a perfectly reasonable position to adopt.

Virginia Godfrey said that certainly in the case of HACAN/Clearskies, residents should have the benefit of the doubt on this all the way along the line.

Jon Phillips replied that this was inherent in the whole consultation document. The residents were being given the benefit of the doubt, as all of the schemes were over and above that which is statutorily available.

19. Peter Viggers asked if the schemes were not applicable if BAA were refused planning permission for a third runway?

Jon Phillips said no, that was not the case as there were certain obligations in the consultation documents that BAA had committed to once a decision had been made to proceed with the application that would kick in, ahead of knowing whether planning permission had been granted for a third runway or not.

The Chairman thanked Jon Phillips for his presentation.

20. The Chairman read the questions on the proposed Home Relocation Assistance scheme from the Noise Consultation to the Members to ascertain a response.

Q1. Is the relocation package formula of £2,500 plus 1.5%; of the house's sold value acceptable?

A. Cllr. Maxwell opposed this on behalf of the residents on fixed income.

Q2. Is a cap of £10,000 on the package reasonable?

A. Maurice Hudson said that he thought that BAA may have overlooked it, but if the Blight consultation document was studied, there was specific mention of meeting the costs of Stamp Duty when a resident had to purchase another property.

On the Noise Consultation, similar reference could not be found. There was the Relocation Assistance examples, and if the upper limit was studied,, if a resident intended to purchase a house for £500,000 or above, BAA proposed to offer

relocation assistance with a cap of £10,000. Stamp Duty on a house of this value at 4% would equate to £20,000 and people would be considerably out of pocket.

He said that that the Committee might like to draw this fact to the attention of BAA and suggest that this matter be dealt with on the same basis as the Blight compensation.

This was agreed.

Q3. Should the initial scheme run for five years allowing for a review in 2010?

A. Maurice Hudson stated that given the fact that house prices are fluctuating rather, as Jon Phillips had referred to, it would be sensible to have a review period. Five years would certainly allow observation on what major changes had occurred over that period. Members may feel that another time period was more applicable, but a review period should be in place.

Cllr. Maxwell said that this reflected the trend that gradually, house prices were reducing and in five years' time would be well reduced.

It was agreed that five years was acceptable.

Q4. Do you agree that there should be qualifying criteria designed to prevent unfair speculation in the local market?

A. This was agreed.

Q5. Do you have any further comments to make regarding the Home Relocation scheme?

A. Members had covered this aspect under the question and answer session following the presentation made by Jon Phillips.

21. The Chairman read the questions on the proposed Heathrow Property Market Support Bond from the Blight Consultation to the Members to ascertain a response.

Q1. If BAA Heathrow decided to introduce a Property Market Support Bond, would you support the scheme?

A. Yes, this was agreed.

Q2. Is the name 'Property Market Support Bond' easily understandable? Do you propose any alternative name?

A. Not easily understandable. No alternative name suggested.

Q3. Do you agree that BAA Heathrow should use the June 2002 Land Registry values as the starting point for index-linking property values? If not, what alternative starting point would you suggest?

A. Cllr. Ceaser suggested the Halifax and Nationwide Building Societies' values be used as he believed that the Land Registry tended to be slightly later than the building societies, in the property market values they indicate.

22. The Chairman asked Jon Phillips why the date of June 2002 had been chosen as the bench-mark?

Jon Phillips said that June 2002 was the date immediately prior to the Government publishing the SERAS consultation which put lines on the map at Heathrow.

Q4. Should the scheme only be open to owner-occupiers – those who would be the most financially penalised by any development related fall in the property market?

A. Cllr. Maxwell asked how this affected the multi-ownership of houses in the Borough?

Maurice Hudson pointed out that these houses were excluded from the scheme as they were classified as commercial premises.

Jon Phillips added that the dilemma for BAA was that there was a general consensus to support the question that they should avoid property speculation, e.g. people that might be purchasing properties in order to rent them out and make a profit. It could be argued that tenants would not be financially penalised by the reduction in value of a property as they only paid rent and would not necessarily lose out.

Maurice Hudson asked if in terms of relocation expenses, would tenants be applicable for these?

Virginia Godfrey said that relocation expenses should certainly not be restricted to homeowners.

Jon Phillips replied there was none proposed. The question should be asked why were tenants finding it necessary to move.

Cllr. Oswell said that tenants should be included as they would incur costs that had nothing to do with the fact that they did not own the property, but the fact that they would have to seek somewhere else to live and therefore costs would be involved.

Don Gregory suggested that as there were so many variables on this subject that goodwill and flexibility had to be relied upon. Yes, it was agreed that tenants should be looked after, but on a different basis to home-owners.

Q5. Do you agree with BAA Heathrow's proposal to restrict eligibility in order to prevent property speculation in the area after the White Paper was published?

A. Members had answered this in Q4. above.

The Chairman thanked the Members for their contribution to the consultation questions.

2866 BRITISH AIRWAYS “SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT 2004”

This report had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

2867 BAA HEATHROW “FLIGHT EVALUATION REPORT 2003/2004”

This report had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted, together with notification that it was also available on the BAA website.

2868 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee held on 22nd September 2004 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.
2. The Chairman referred to the letter submitted to the Committee by Cllr. Mike Cartwright representing LB Hammersmith & Fulham, concerning the London Underground’s plan to close the Piccadilly Line in the Barons Court area for several weekends next year, starting at Easter 2005. The through service between Central London and Heathrow will be severed at these very busy times. However, there would be an alternative replacement bus service put in place.
3. Maurice Hudson said, in the absence of Philip Carlisle, the Chairman of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee, he had chaired the meeting at which there was a lot of discussion relating to this subject.

Fortuitously, John Kateley the General Manager of National Express, had attended the meeting to address the Committee, who as a company were quite involved in providing transport services and possibly any alternative services that might be put on as a result of this.

The Sub-Committee had not previously been informed of the proposal to close the Piccadilly Line in the Barons Court area, where London Underground were considering which bus services they could provide.

The Sub-Committee were quite concerned that as Easter was one of the busiest times at Heathrow Airport (together with Christmas), they had not been notified of this closure. It was therefore proposed to enquire of London Underground, in conjunction with BAA, as to what was actually involved and how many and which weekends the closures would take place.

It was noted that at the same time, National Express had given notice that they intend to withdraw the Airbus route A2 which assisted many passengers to travel from Heathrow Airport into Central London, something the Sub-Committee regretted.

Cllr. Cartwright had written to Transport for London on behalf of LB Hammersmith & Fulham, that the A2 service be maintained, at least during the disruption caused by these

closures. Terminal 4 station will also be closed at the same time for a much longer period (the whole of 2005).

Cllr. Cartwright had suggested that both the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee and BAA supported the position and BAA should consider subsidising the service itself, if necessary.

Maurice Hudson said there was a big question mark over this issue, but there was an obvious problem to which the Committee did not, as yet have an answer, but would investigate.

4. Cllr. Khursheed agreed with Cllr. Cartwright that this situation should be addressed as London Underground had not been open about the whole situation.

In addition to closing the Piccadilly Line on 7th, 8th and 9th January 2005, it had only recently been ascertained by LB Hillingdon that an e-mail had been issued from London Underground informing that it was proposed to also close the Central Terminal Stations 1, 2 and 3 on 15th and 16th January 2005 creating a disservice to both staff and members of the public.

As far as the A2 bus service was concerned, as it was now operated by National Express.

it was agreed that support was needed from BAA on the funding and National Express should be informed that the A2 bus route was very important service and many passengers travelled into London and the Russell Square area.

Cllr. Khursheed said a problem would also be experienced by the passengers at Hatton Cross as although considerable factors had been taken into consideration, one aspect that had not was the toilet facilities. At present, there was one available toilet, outside the station, provided by the LB Hillingdon. However, the minute it became unusable, due to a passenger inserting the incorrect coinage, no toilet facilities were available for the members of the public.

5. Roy Featherstone referred to one subject that had been on the agenda of the Passenger Services Committee for a considerable time and concerned the Members, being the lack of facilities for the disabled at Hatton Cross. It was understood that the solution, in the form of either a moving stairs or a stair-lift had been rejected by London Underground on the grounds of cost.

Roy Featherstone addressed Eryl Smith and stated that the Members of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee did not operate at a high enough level to influence this decision. Bearing in mind how much passenger traffic travelled through Hatton Cross, it was believed that the Press would take up the story, when the trains stop going into Terminal 4 in January 2005. A decision should be made at the highest level to rectify this problem, although it was acknowledged that it was very late in the day to redress the situation

Jon Phillips had noted the points made by the Members.

6. John Gurney referred to the proposal as outlined by the Mayor, Ken Livingstone, where he had asked Transport for London to examine the case for running a later service on the London Underground on Friday and Saturday nights. This could adversely affect both airport staff and early morning passengers.

It was understood that Transport for London will be undertaking a wide consultation to gather views, to which the Committee will be able to respond. Tube users, businesses and workers will all be involved.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

2869 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report Figures for July to September 2004 and LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for July to September 2004 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

2870 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE REPORT

BAA Heathrow Night Quota Usage Report for the Summer period 2004 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

2871 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for October and November 2004 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

2872 PRESS & NEWS RELEASES

Press and News Releases were circulated with the Agenda for information and were noted.

2873 NEW BATTLE OVER NIGHT FLIGHT NOISE WAGED BY RICHMOND COUNCIL

1. An attachment submitted by Cllr. Rodney Bennett was circulated with the Agenda for information and was noted
2. Cllr. Maddan updated the Members on this item. An application had been made for the Judicial Review and in view of the fact that the second stage of the consultation will be published, this could be heard before Christmas.

2874 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. There were no further items to discuss and the Chairman closed the meeting.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING - WEDNESDAY 26th JANUARY 2005