

## HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2005 at Heathrow Point West

### PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Margaret Majumdar	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. Jafar Khaled	-	LB Hammersmith & Fulham
Cllr. Digby Jacks	-	LB Hounslow.
Cllr. Ajmer Dhillon	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. David Bishop	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. John Oswell (Deputy)	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Mike Cox	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Jim Maddan	-	LB Wandsworth
Cllr. Rodney Bennett	-	LB Richmond upon Thames
Cllr. Chris Turrell	-	Bracknell Forest BC
Cllr. Bill Lidgate (Deputy)	-	Bucks CC
Cllr. Alan Oxley (Deputy)	-	South Bucks CC
Cllr. Julia Long	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Gerry Ceaser	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos	-	Surrey County Council
Richard Barnes	-	London Assembly
Cllr. Anne Whitehead	-	ALG
Philip Carlisle	-	GTMC
Roy Featherstone	-	ABTA
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Peter Viggers	-	EANAG
John Gurney	-	TUC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
Gareth Harper	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Donald Gregory	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent

### OTHERS:

David Gray	-	Department for Transport
------------	---	--------------------------

### HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Janis Kong	-	BAA Executive Chairman
Mike Forster	-	Director of Business Strategy
Ben Morton	-	Director of Communications
Tabitha Stebbings	-	Head of Aviation Policy Studies

## **APOLOGIES:**

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

Virginia Godfrey/John Stewart (HACAN/Clearksies), Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed (LB Hillingdon).

2. The Chairman announced that Roy Featherstone who had been a Member of the Committee for the past 18 years had decided to step down from his role. Roy had been a valuable Member over the years with suggestions and proposals to HACC and was thanked for all he had done during the time he had served on the Committee. A photograph featuring Roy, taken at a HACC meeting some years previously, was handed to him as a memento by the Chairman. Roy would be replaced by Susan Parsons as the representative for ABTA.

3. It was also announced that Gill Kirk, Head of Public Affairs was leaving BAA to pursue her career outside of the company.

4. The Chairman wished Peter Viggers a Happy 80th Birthday for the 4th October 2005.

5. A note had been received from Brian Yates who represented the 'Consumers' Association, referring to the presentation made to the Committee some months previously on the 'Silent Aircraft' project. One of the team leaders from the Cambridge MIT project, Dr. Tom Reynolds, gave a one-day lecture at the British Association, complete with noise demonstrations, audience participation, video clips and graphic animations. The lecture won the Brunel prize.

It was suggested that those on the Committee with a specific interest in noise issues might wish to see the complete lecture which can be downloaded from <http://www.cusp.org.uk/festival>.

## **2950 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2005 were agreed with the following amendments:-

1. Roger Wiltshire referred to minute 2940 (3). This should read *'the A380, currently being tested, had been specifically designed to meet noise criteria at Heathrow, which in turn had led to a 2% penalty on fuel for particular aircraft'*.

## **2951 MATTERS ARISING**

1. The Chairman gave feedback on matters arising from the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2005.
  - HAL agreed to come back with details of the new noise and blight schemes. Gill Kirk would be giving a presentation at the September HACC meeting.
  - BAA had provided list of airline alliances to the Secretary for the July Minutes

- Improved night flights and general noise-related information on the web: Public Affairs were working on improved noise communications – by ‘phone, online and in hard copy. HACC would be kept up-to-date on this
  - Members wanted to know who was responsible for presenting on the environmental aspect of Air Quality. This sat in the Environmental Solutions team, led by Amanda Owen.
  - Nita Easey & Cllr Roberts spoke about possible local ‘Go-Arounds’ and a demo had been arranged. Cllr Roberts agreed that this was a better way of answering his queries and therefore withdrew his request for the statistics on ‘Go-Arounds’ to be broken down further.
  - There were concerns about BAA’s website addresses. They were currently being reworked to make them simpler – for example, heathrowairport.com, with a simpler set of subsections. Members would see this roll out in the coming months.
  - Members requested more frequent Reports on Night Quota usage. BAA would now double the frequency from one report per season to two reports per season – at the halfway stage and at the end of each season. The first interim report was circulated with the Minutes of the last meeting.
2. Cllr. Bishop referred to the ‘Baggage Handling tour that had been arranged for the July meeting. It would be remembered that the events surrounding the tour were somewhat chaotic. A number of the Members were left stranded and not able to go on the tour if they did not possess a Passport to gain access Airside. It was requested that a repeat tour be arranged, with more advance notification in order that the Members could arrange suitable identification. A request was made that if a tour of the transportation facilities between Terminal 5 and the Central Terminal Area could be organised, this would be even better, if this was up and running.

Mrs. Kong said that the Airside Tunnel would be available for a visit. This was agreed.

3. At the July meeting, Cllr. Bishop had requested that the Committee received a regular written report on air quality in the local community. Due to the need to know whether air quality was improving or deteriorating, it was important to receive statistics.

Cllr. Bishop reported that the Hillingdon Council were undergoing a Corporate Awareness Assessment. Cllr. Bishop read verbatim from a document, the contents of which formed part of that assessment.

*‘the Council had arranged a specific environmental management strategy and action plan to seek awareness and guide practice such as air quality and environmental biodiversity action plans. We would ask for a long-term air quality action plan, with particular focus on the South of the Borough, which comes under considerable pressure because of the airport and traffic congestion that comes with this road gateway into Central London’.*

*'A recent example is the installation of new air quality monitoring equipment in Cranford of February of this year helping to record pollution levels close to Heathrow on the busy roads such as the Bath Road'.*

The Chairman responded that one or two slots had already been promised to the Members with topics of interest for the Annual HACC Seminar on 7th December 2005. It was suggested that a presentation on air quality could also form part of the event.

4. Rob Gibson stated that he had been assigned to bring to the Members of HACC a written report on air quality. This has yet to be completed. It was agreed that this would be brought to the next HACC meeting.(Seminar) on 7th December 2005.
5. Peter Viggers referred to Minute 2932 (a) A380 and asked if there was an update available on his request for a presentation to be brought to the HACC on the A380's noise footprint.

Mike Forster said this would be brought forward at the next HACC meeting.

6. The Technical Adviser stated he had just returned from Canada where he had attended a meeting of the North American Airports. The same question had been raised with regard to the A380, by people who had been trying to get footprints. Airbus had been unable to honour this request as they had not yet completed all the necessary tests. Therefore, it may be that the Committee would not receive an answer for another few months.

## **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

### **2952 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT**

#### **1. Committee Membership**

The Chairman welcomed Cllr. Anne Whitehead from the **Association of London Government** as a new Member of the Committee (Cllr. Bridget Fox as Deputy), together with Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos (Staines) from **Surrey County Council** (Cllr. Victor Agarwal (Stanwell) as Deputy).

### **2953 COMMENTARY FROM THE EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN, BAA HEATHROW**

1. The BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been circulated and was noted.
2. Mrs. Kong said that the traffic levels at the airport for the last couple of months had been affected by the London bombings in July and the Gate Gourmet dispute. Although the dispute was between British Airways and Gate Gourmet, Mrs. Kong said that she was very pleased with the active participation by BAA and the way they collaborated with British Airways, to assist the passengers significantly affected at that time.

In addition to this, there were severe storms at the beginning of September. There had been interesting weather predicted and BAA tried to inform the appropriate parts of the community according to that advance warning. Obviously, it was not always possible to do that. The inclement weather, coupled with a high level of easterly operations during the Summer resulted in a high level of disruption. Mrs. Kong said that she was very aware that this troubled people in the community, but unfortunately BAA were not always in control of the circumstances.

3. **Terminal 5** – remained on schedule and budget. At the beginning of September, members of the local community and almost 3,000 workers celebrated the completion of the T5 building structure with a ‘Topping Out’ Ceremony. The Secretary of State for Transport, Alistair Darling addressed the attendees and praised the project. Site visits to the project continued to be of general public interest.
4. **A380 Developments** – a significant benchmark had been reached in the development of Pier 6, the state-of-the-art building that had been designed specifically to meet the needs of the A380. The first complete gate room at Pier 6 had now been unveiled. This was one of the four gate rooms that would make up the new 280 metre long glass-fronted building and it marked a significant step forward in the ongoing transformation of BAA Heathrow.
5. **Draft Interim Master Plan** – the consultation period was open until the end of October 2006. BAA continued to meet with local authorities and other interested groups in the local community. Almost 1,000 hard copies of the document had been distributed, which was still available on the internet at [www.heathrow.com/masterplan](http://www.heathrow.com/masterplan). BAA expected to publish an updated Master Plan as soon as was practicable in 2006. The Committee would be updated on progress in the coming months.
6. **Noise and Blight Schemes** – details of these schemes had now been published, which had arisen as a result of the Government’s White Paper. (*A presentation was made to the Committee by Gill Kirk, BAA Head of Public Affairs under Item 7*). The schemes had been designed to protect the airport and the local property market in regard to the prospect of future expansion at Heathrow. Public exhibitions and meetings had been held in the local community relating to the schemes.
7. **Night Flight Restrictions – Stage 2 of the Consultation** - BAA had submitted a response to the Government’s consultation and would be seeking no additional movements.
8. **BAA’s Volunteering Awards:** – BAA had just launched its second annual Employee Volunteering Awards Scheme, ‘I-Volunteer’. The BAA Communities Trust was providing awards of £2,000 and £5,000 to the winners’ chosen charities or organisations.

- 8.1 Following on from this report, Members asked questions/responded.
- 8.2 Cllr. Bishop referred to the fact that it had been stated by Mrs. Kong that Terminal 5 would be completed on time. He was concerned that the Government, in its wisdom, had decided to abandon the re-valuation of council properties. On the 'News' this decision had been reported as a cause for the delay of Crossrail by a further year. If this was true, the LB Hillingdon were very concerned that there would be so much emphasis on cars and an inadequate emphasis on public transport, which was so badly needed.

Terminal 5 would probably open on time, but if Crossrail was not available, this would cause a problem.

In addition, it had been proposed that there was a colossal multi-storey car park constructed on the old Southall Gas Works site operated by 'Pink Elephant'. This would result in vehicles running backwards and forwards between Southall and Heathrow Airport, which would increase further the flow of traffic. It would be much preferred that the emphasis was placed on public transport.

Mrs. Kong responded that Crossrail was never going to be constructed in time for the opening of Terminal 5. However, the importance of adequate public transport in place was understood.

- 8.3 Cllr. Dhillon referred to the article in the Press on the weekend of 24th/25th September 2005, relating to suggested congestion charging on the M4.

Mrs. Kong replied that when BAA submitted a response to the Government at the time of the SERAS study, in order to meet the conditions required and also to resolve the traffic problem, BAA had not discussed any further what this would cover, other than to say that the inflow of traffic into the Heathrow area needed to be addressed. It was not known where the facts arising from the Press article relating to the M4 had originated from. The whole area of Heathrow needed to be considered in this debate.

- 8.4 David Gray added that the weekend reports were largely a non-news story. They had originated from a document that had been openly shared with the Surface Access Stakeholder Group last year and were subsequently published on the DfT website. The origin of the work itself was in the follow-up to the Thames Valley Multi-Modal Study which was one of a number of studies looking at road and rail solutions around the country. As part of that, a number of possible scenarios, which included the possibility of introducing some kind of road-user charging were debated. However, it was no more than that. There were no proposals for tolling the M4 by 2008, as had been suggested. Of course, in the context of the project for the Sustainable Development of Heathrow, the Department for Transport were looking, as the White Paper had stated, at the whole issue of demand management on the road network.

The Department for Transport would take into account comments such as those made by the Members, in relation to the implications of tolling or charging on particular sections of the road. Otherwise the reports in the Press were largely speculative.

- 8.5 Peter Viggers asked what the current situation was regarding the fare charges on Heathrow Connect from Hayes Station into the airport. A member of EANAG had suggested that at the present rate of fare, it did not encourage passengers to get out of their cars and use the train as an alternative.
- 8.6 Peter Viggers announced that the Ealing Aircraft Noise Action Group would be holding a meeting on 24th October 2005 in Ealing Town Hall, regarding the BAA Heathrow Draft Interim Master Plan. All people were welcome to attend. On behalf of BAA, Mr. Richard Bayley, would be the guest speaker.
- 8.7 Cllr. Gerry Ceaser referred to road charging and asked that if it was to be considered in the future for the area of Heathrow, when the discussions came forward, could it be remembered that there were parts outside of Greater London that would be vastly affected by any road charging regime that came into force.

He requested that the Members would like to be involved in any discussions that may occur at an early stage, in order that the impact might be assessed on the residents outside of Greater London.

- 8.8 Cllr. Bennett asked if the fact that BAA would not be seeking additional night flights would be publicised.

Mrs. Kong said the information was on the BAA website.

- 8.9 Cllr. Majumdar asked if no additional movements referred to by Mrs. Kong meant no additional movements over the actual, or no additional movements over what would have been permitted as the maximum.

Mrs. Kong replied the latter. The Government had suggested that the Quota limit of movements would increase. BAA had requested that the movements remain as at present. BAA were not seeking additional movements other than those currently in operation.

- 8.10 Iain Hope referred to the question of public transport access from the West and the economics of Airtrack. It was interesting to note that it had been proposed that Reading Station should be rebuilt as one of the three main station rebuild operations in the South East. It was hoped that BAA would support this suggestion, as it was absolutely essential that the station was re-built with an extra platform to get proper rail connections to the West, which might reduce the amount of traffic currently coming into the airport.

- 8.11 Philip Carlisle said that as a commuter, he was impressed with the reported ‘TV News’ issues during the Gate Gourmet dispute and he had seen three BAA managers that he knew talking to the passengers, which was more than anybody else involved in the dispute was doing. This was not seen during such disputes involving GNER or British Rail. The BAA staff deserved a compliment.

#### **2954 ‘MIXED-MODE’ OPERATIONS**

1. Discussion on the alleged increase in the number of occasions when Heathrow is operating ‘Mixed-Mode’ as suggested by Cllr. Rodney Bennett, LB Richmond on Thames.
2. In response to Cllr. Bennett’s query, the Chairman introduced Phil Layton from NATS who gave a short presentation on ‘mixed-mode’.

Phil Layton explained that his jurisdiction ran to the airport with the Control Towers. The Approach Control for Heathrow was managed by the West Drayton Terminal Control. This facility was on the move to Swanwick in 2007. Shortly thereafter the West Drayton division would close.

‘Mixed-Mode’ was a concept of operation that was tended to be thought of for each individual airport. For Heathrow, this meant that for both runways, NATS would operate a mixture of landings and take-offs from each runway. That concept did not operate at present. It does not happen. On westerlies, segregated mode was operational, whereby landings were from 7.00 a.m. – 3.00 p.m. on one runway and then changed over. On easterlies, with the Cranford Agreement, which prevented take-offs from 09L which was the Northern Runway, departing traffic used the Southern Runway and the Northern Runway was left for landings. This was generally the concept of operations at Heathrow.

When there was a lot of holding and delays were up to thirty minutes on westerlies, NATS were permitted to land some arrivals on the departure runway when on the westerly regime. However, a high level of delay was required in order to do this. This was caused primarily by windy weather, which reduced the overall landing rate and the time factor and the head-wind that aircraft flew into. When a high level of delay of thirty minutes was apparent, the Tower then usually granted Approach Control permission to land a small number of aircraft on the departure runway.

Approach Control at West Drayton normally arranged those flights to be optimised at the Vortex gap. Some Members may be aware, that when a 747 was due to land and a smaller aircraft such as the Airbus A320 followed it, a separation gap of five miles had to be applied between each aircraft.

By putting one plane on the departure runway, it enabled NATS to close up on the other runway onto a radar minimum of generally, three miles. An advantage could be achieved by putting a small number on the departure runway. This concept was known as TEAM (**T**actile **E**nhanced **A**rrivals **M**asures). It was generally used for very short periods of the day and was rarely used beyond a couple of hours, before the demand had dropped away and it was no longer required.

On easterlies, there was no alternation as such. An internal measure was used of approximately twenty minutes. If there was more than twenty minutes holding on easterlies, permission may be requested to land some aircraft on the Southern Runway 09R. This was an internal NATS arrangement, but the same procedure was copied for westerly operations.

Between 6.00 a.m. – 7.00 a.m. there was often a high demand of North Atlantic flights which arrived early with tail-winds across the Atlantic. During this period of time, NATS were permitted to land on both runways. There was a trial ongoing to try to get the alternation to go through to 7.00 a.m. However, there were criteria; between 6.00 a.m. – 6.30 a.m. if there was a ten minute delay, it would be permissible to land on both runways. Between 6.30 a.m. 7.00 a.m. if there was a delay of only five minutes, it would be permissible to land on both runways. The intention of this was to start at 7.00 a.m. with no delay. This was achieved by and large on most occasions. Whatever delay had occurred by 7.00 a.m. this would be carried forward right through to the first Domestic Arrival wave for the remainder of the morning. Therefore, it was important that NATS cleared the stacks ready for 7.00 a.m.

There was no ‘mixed-mode’ in operation at Heathrow in NATS terms, involved in landing and in departing from both runways. This was simply not done.

3. Following on from this report, Members asked questions/responded.
- 3.1 Cllr. Bennett thanked Phil Layton for the interesting presentation.
- 3.2 Rob Gibson asked what figure was quantified as small, in this context.

Phil Layton replied six flights or less.

- 3.3 Philip Carlisle asked, at its worst, what effect did this have on departure delays when NATS had to use TEAM for arrivals.

Phil Layton responded that when using TEAM, NATS would not be getting the normal landing rate, as the wind would have slowed everything up and the inbound rate would be reduced. TEAM enabled NATS to bring this back up to almost a normal path on those difficult days. The departure rate was not normally affected.

## **2955 BAA NOISE AND BLIGHT ASSISTANCE SCHEMES**

1. Presentation by Gill Kirk, BAA Head of Public Affairs on the BAA Noise and Blight Assistance Schemes (*enclosed*).

The BAA schemes were introduced to deal with current airport noise and potential property blight resulting from the impact of the White Paper. Public exhibitions had been taken out into the community. It was a big project.

All HACC members had been sent copies of the documents. (*Any new Member to the Committee who wished to obtain a copy of the relevant documents, should contact the Secretary. Extra copies were available from the Public Affairs Team*).

## **Why the need for the schemes?**

There was an area where there may be a third runway. However, this did not mean that because BAA had introduced the schemes that there would be a third runway constructed. That would be a decision for the Government's White Paper review at the end of 2006. However, there was currently no support for the local property market and the Blight schemes aimed to provide that now.

The Noise schemes build on existing residential insulation schemes for people affected by today's airport.

### **Blight**

- Two schemes
  - based on transferable agreements
  - with a "trigger" requiring BAA to buy the property if the owner chooses

### **Property Market Support Bond**

- inside the possible extended airport boundary

### **Home Owner Support Scheme**

- beyond that, where there would be new medium-high noise levels (2002 66 Leq)

### **Noise**

- Two schemes to protect the community from today's airport noise

### **Home Relocation Assistance Scheme**

- up to £12,500 to help homeowners move away from 69 Leq

### **Community Buildings Noise Insulation Scheme**

- insulating schools, colleges, hospices, hospitals, nurseries, libraries and community halls in 63 Leq
- work led by the community

### **BAA Communication with the public**

#### **Blight**

- Notices in local Press, discussions with Residents' Associations, Local Focus Forum, MPs, Councillors and Estate Agents
- 84 calls to Heathrow's scheme administration line
- 21 e-mails received
- 4 Public Exhibitions to date

### **Home Relocation Assistance Scheme**

- BAA notices in the local Press, discussions with Residents' Associations, MPs and Councillors
- 132 calls to the scheme administration line
- 18 e-mails received
- 5 public exhibitions

### **Next Steps**

#### **Blight**

- Valuers appointed and valuations for property Market Support Bond start in October

### **Home Relocation Assistance Scheme**

- Payments will be processed from October

### **Community Buildings Noise Insulation Scheme**

- Now in discussions about setting up the community led body which will manage the scheme
- Eligible properties will be contacted by this group

### **Queries about the schemes**

- **020 8745 4929**
- [heathrowbond@baa.com](mailto:heathrowbond@baa.com)
- [heathrowhoss@baa.com](mailto:heathrowhoss@baa.com)
- [heathrowrelocationassistance@baa.com](mailto:heathrowrelocationassistance@baa.com)
- [heathrowcommunitybuildings@baa.com](mailto:heathrowcommunitybuildings@baa.com)

### **Alternative format booklets**

- **020 8731 4247**

### **On the web**

- [www.heathrowairport.com/bond](http://www.heathrowairport.com/bond)
- [www.heathrowairport.com/hoss](http://www.heathrowairport.com/hoss)
- [www.heathrowairport.com/relocationassistance](http://www.heathrowairport.com/relocationassistance)
- [www.heathrowairport.com/community/buildings](http://www.heathrowairport.com/community/buildings)

### **Extra copies**

- **0800 169 5569**

2. The Technical Adviser referred to reports (**HACC 434**) and (**HACC 433**) which were linked to the presentation in Minute 2955.

When the Committee had looked at the noise related assistance schemes previously, it had been recommended that amongst other places to which the scheme should apply, would be Day Care Centres and Places of Worship which were not now included within the final BAA schemes.

The Technical Adviser made reference to paragraph 9 of the report (**HACC 434**) where it was stated that BAA was setting up a community led body to oversee the administration of the scheme and would fund it up to a limit of £5 million in any financial year. Given the variety of organisations represented on HACC and the range of local knowledge and experience, it was suggested in paragraph 18, that Members may wish to recommend to BAA Heathrow that the Committee should be represented on that community led body.

The Committee had also made representations that the original scheme did not make any provision for the payment or reimbursement of Stamp Duty that residents would need to pay on the purchase of a property. BAA had now included the reimbursement of Stamp Duty, but only to the value which related to the house that was being sold, where the Stamp Duty was not applicable, rather than the house that was being purchased on which Stamp Duty would be applicable. It could be that if a resident sold a property at a depreciated price, there would be little alternative but to purchase another property in a rather higher Band, somewhere which was not close to the airport. In such an instance there might be a short-fall of money when reimbursing the Stamp Duty.

The document did emphasise that the scheme was designed to assist people in moving to a quieter area if they so wished, but yet there was no obligation. In order to get the necessary benefit of the reimbursement, a resident would need to move to a property that was outside the noise contour. They would not receive the benefit, if they remained within the same noise contour as they would not be improving their quality of life because of noise.

The Committee had proposed to BAA that the 'Home Relocation' scheme should be reviewed in 2007, on a par with the 'Noise Insulation and Mitigation' scheme. It was then proposed and agreed that the review would be held in five years' time (2010), as opposed to 2007.

There had been some changes on the 'Property Blight Assistance' schemes, following the recommendations that the Committee had made to BAA. However, there were a couple of suggestions that had not been reflected e.g. the Committee had advocated using a commercial Property Index, rather than that of the Land Registry.

The scheme had been amended in order that some Landlords would be able to let their property and still be eligible for assistance. BAA had also included provision for an 'Early Movers Home Purchase' scheme.

3. Gill Kirk responded that one of the points made by BAA was to list in the document, the questions asked, the responses received, the decision made by BAA and why. Most of the queries arising from the schemes would be outlined at the front of the document.

4. Cllr. Cox referred to a point of concern, which was the fact that BAA would build up a stock of houses as a result of the schemes. The question was asked of the intention by BAA as to what they would do with these houses. Would they be converted into houses of multiple-occupation, in which case there could be problem with unsocial behaviour, particularly in the Heathrow villages where the properties would be purchased.

Mrs. Kong responded that she did not have the answer to this question.

It was almost a case of wanting to put this back to the communities to ask what this scenario could look like. The purchase of properties by BAA would not be known for many, many years to come, if that ever happened at all. It was known what the best option would be; was it better to rent a property out and keep it occupied, or was it better to demolish. As this was a long way into the future, this would need to be discussed with the LB Hillingdon.

Cllr. Cox believed that this particular conversation needed to take place with the Council as there was a shortage of affordable houses in the Borough and these properties could be useful, certainly in the short-term.

5. Rob Gibson made a point that had been relayed to Gil Kirk previously, that he did not believe that it should be left to the community grouping to decide on who received ventilation. Education in schools was very important. There were Building Standards that needed to be achieved. The children might get relief from the noise, but 'boil to death' from lack of ventilation.

A further point was made in relation to the boundary scheme, where in Heston if a resident lived at an 'odd' numbered property, a resident would be included in the scheme, but if they lived in an 'even' numbered property they were not.

Gill Kirk responded that as previously explained, with all the BAA 'Mitigation' schemes there would always be a boundary. With regard to the debate on the 'odd' and 'even' house numbers, the noise contour went down the middle of the road and that was the reason. However, this would be reviewed as noise contours changed.

6. Cllr. Bennett commented that as he sat on the Licensing Committee for the LB Richmond upon Thames, he had become aware that there had been a number of applications from residents at Kew, who had constantly requested that the Council shut down clubs earlier, in order to give the community a reasonable chance of some sleep before the aeroplanes started to wake them up at 4.30 a.m.

Another practical point to note that Cllr. Bennett had become aware of recently, was the fact that the area in which he lived had a significant number of buildings which were either Listed or in Conservation areas, which made sound-proofing a more expensive and complicated business.

7. Paul Ellis asked if in relation to the Noise scheme in particular, how would any 'new-build' houses or schools be treated. Would these establishments automatically become eligible.

Gill Kirk responded that for the 'Noise Relocation' schemes, it was to help people who were currently living within the noise contour at the time of the scheme being launched, and wished to move away from that. People moving into the noise contour, would not be eligible. With regard to noise sensitive buildings, any newly built establishments should be built to the correct specifications for noise and insulated accordingly.

It was explained that in relation to blight, initially, BAA had proposed that a resident would not be eligible for the scheme if a resident moved into the area after the White Paper was published. This factor had caused considerable concern for a lot of people until BAA removed that restriction completely.

8. Cllr. Majumdar said that she was puzzled by the omission of one building from the Hillingdon third runway scheme, and was dismayed regarding some omissions from the 'Noise Insulation' scheme. The building that would appear to be missing from the Hillingdon scheme was the Heathrow Primary School which had not appeared on the list at all. It was presumed that this was a building that BAA would need to buy, if there was to be a third runway, as it was in the middle of the block of land that would be affected.

On the 'Noise Insulation' scheme. Cllr. Majumdar had raised many times at the HACC meetings, that there were a dozen or more schools which were very badly affected by noise all the time, when the wind was in the east, which could be up to a third of the time. Mrs. Kong had promised to look at this from time to time and yet no Ealing school appeared on the list of those included under the scheme. A request was made that this could be reconsidered.

Gill Kirk responded that the 'Property Market Support Bond' and the 'Home Owner Support' blight scheme were for commercial and residential properties only. The value of the property (school) was not going to be blighted, in the same way as a home-owner or small commercial business. It was for this reason that it had not been included.

Cllr. Majumdar replied that presumably the property (school) would be valueless.

Gill Kirk said that discussions were currently ongoing with the LB Hillingdon on other types of buildings that would be impacted. However, the BAA schemes were specifically for home-owners and small commercial properties because they would be the most impacted.

Cllr. Majumdar responded that this information had not reached her colleagues at the LB Hillingdon who had to deal with the issues of schools for the next few years.

Gill Kirk replied that she had not received feedback from the LB Hillingdon in relation to schools, but would happily discuss this.

9. Peter Viggers asked if roofs were included under the 'Noise Insulation' scheme ,as a lot of the noise nuisance could in fact come through the roof, as opposed to the side of the windows.

Gill Kirk replied that the insulation scheme was to be to the same standard as those currently carried out by BAA for the residential schemes, which it was believed, did involve roofs.

10. Roger Wiltshire asked a supplementary question in relation to 'new build' homes and presumed that if a resident moved out of a property in the area, that the house in question could not therefore be used by a second set of occupants to claim under the assisted schemes.

Gill Kirk residents replied that this was correct. If a person moved into the area after the BAA scheme was launched in July 2005, they would not be eligible.

11. The Chairman reported that in Los Angeles Airport, over 100 million dollars had been spent on acquiring properties. The whole area had been cleared of buildings and as a result, there were lots of streets within an open space which had to be kept clean and maintained.

12. The Chairman asked the Members if they wished to be actively represented on the Community Group, if the Committee were actively invited to do so.

Cllr. Ceaser responded that he thought that the Members of HACC should be involved in the Community Group. They also needed to be directly involved in the Noise scheme to have some real input.

13. Cllr. Dhillon asked what was the definition of the 'Community Group'.

The Chairman read from the Paper. 'It was a community led body which would be shaped through BAA Heathrow's discussions with the local community'.

**2956 NOISE RELATED ASSISTANCE SCHEMES FOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITY**  
Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 434**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

**2957 PROPERTY BLIGHT ASSISTANCE SCHEMES**  
Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 433**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

**2958 NIGHT FLYING RESTRICTIONS AT BAA LONDON AIRPORTS**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser with draft reply to consultation (**HACC 435**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman stated that when the report was prepared, the Secretariat had not received any written responses from Member organisations. Therefore, the draft letter had been prepared on the basis of previous discussions within the Committee. However, a few days before the HACC meeting, several written submissions with views of various representative bodies had been received from EANAG, HACAN/Clearskies, ABTA and Surrey County Council. These submissions were tabled.

The opportunity was offered to those representatives who submitted written Papers to add further comments if they so wished.

Peter Viggers who represented EANAG referred to not only night flights, but to the whole question of establishing that there was an economic justification for Heathrow, in its broadest terms. It had been stated many times, that Heathrow was vitally important to the economy. A request was made that this be put in writing in some considerable detail, before it was agreed that the economic justification was a good idea.

3. Cllr. Bennett confirmed that the LB Richmond upon Thames would like a total ban on night flights. However, it was agreed that an exception could be granted when there was a major international disaster, such as the Tsunami. It was thought that in such circumstances, bringing people back to the UK should not be delayed.
4. Gareth Harper who represented HACAN/Clearskies asked when referring to a ban at night, what was the actual definition of the times inferred. It was the policy of HACAN/Clearskies to look for a ban between what is now the Quota period and a limit of movements outside of the Quota period

The question was asked if that was also the position of the local authorities or were they seeking a block ban from 11.00 p.m. – 7.00 a.m.

5. The Chairman asked the represented local authorities for their definition of the night period.

Cllr. Khaled confirmed the position of the LB Hammersmith & Fulham was that they were seeking a ban from 11.30 p.m. – 6.00 a.m.

Cllr. Ceaser confirmed the view of Spelthorne BC which was a ban between 11.00 p.m. – 7.00 a.m. He believed this to be the view of the majority of the local authorities around the Heathrow area. This certainly was the view reached by the **Local Authority Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC)** who represented the local authorities.

6. Cllr. Majumdar said that what Cllr. Ceaser had stated was not the view of all local authorities in that the current number of movements from 11.00 p.m. – 7.00 a.m. should be accommodated over the whole night. It should involve a reduction in the number of flights concurrently permitted in the shoulder period.

7. Cllr. Ceaser stated that as far as the number of movements were concerned, the view was the QC count should have a limit. The movements should remain the same. The view, again from LAANC, was that the QC banding should remain as at present, but there should be an upper limit imposed on the number of movements that took place during the year and that should be the existing limit and not the limit that the Government had suggested, which would increase numbers.
8. Cllr. Maddan who represented the LB Wandsworth submitted their written response to the Secretariat following the meeting.
9. Iain Hope referred to Peter Viggers request for economic facts in relation to night flights at Heathrow. He had given this matter as much attention as possible in the timescale permitted, particularly with regard to arriving night flights from South-East Asia.

On behalf of the London Chamber of Commerce, Iain Hope had been asked to make a public point about night flight restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted.

The Members of the London Chamber of Commerce and Industry had historically rejected any reduction in night flights and were strongly supporting a reasonable growth from a business perspective.

The Capital's support for the continuation of night flights was based on the nature of London as a 24-hour business centre, and its transport infrastructure must recognise this fact.

Long-haul flights were affected by time differences and arrival times were restricted by specific time slot allocations. London's unique and unrivalled network of international air services would be downgraded if night flying was further restricted, as it would no longer be seen as a key interchange hub. This would jeopardise London's position as a leading world city.

Express and freight carriers, as well as scheduled services for London air freight, must be able to fly at night in order to meet the current and future demands of business. The demand for overnight services has continued to grow strongly as UK companies adapt to the faster, leaner business models of the new economies and night flights are vital to meeting this demand.

Iain Hope said that the findings of the London Chamber of Commerce were also supported by all the other main London business bodies, including the CBI, London First and the Institute of Directors (IOD).

The question that Peter Viggers raised regarding the importance of South-East Asia had been echoed in the last few days by the Chancellor's views on UK productivity and competitors, with particular comments on the trade and growth opportunities from China and South-East Asia.

Iain Hope brought the focus more to the question raised at the last HACC meeting in July, with regard to flights from Singapore. Attention was drawn to the fact that Singapore was such a vital hub to the UK, because within five hours travel time of the geographical location of Singapore was half the world's population.

China was now the world's biggest exporter and the fourth largest economy. Its average rate of annual growth for the last two decades was 9.5% and continued at that level. In the past, there was a very big state involvement and now the rate of growth was in the private sector companies. State controlled companies in China had halved from 300,00 to 150,000 since 1998. By contrast, local private companies had increased five-fold and foreign enterprises three-fold, between 1998 and 2003.

A further fact to be noted was that of the companies in China, 2,000 were owned by UK investors. Foreign investors, including the UK, dominated the export market and accounted for half of the overseas sales and the trade of China.

It was a fact of life that growth was required in the UK export trade. The declining oil industry was already causing great concern, as stated at the Party Conferences currently being held.

Iain Hope said that the HACC Members should face no illusions as to the trade difficulties being faced by the UK. Growth in the export markets was needed.

At the last HACC meeting, South-East Asia had been identified as the UK's major export market with the biggest growth. However, it did have problems and that was the question of time differentials and the flight times, particularly to and from airports South of Hong Kong, (including Hong Kong), Shanghai, Singapore, Indonesia and Australia. Thus, the continued need for night flights.

10. The Chairman referred to **HACC 435** and the suggested draft reply to the Department for Transport on behalf of the Committee.

The question was put to the Committee if they were prepared to grant authority to the Chairman and the Technical Adviser to adjust the draft response accordingly, in light of the latest submissions by Member organisations to the Secretariat.

The Chairman stated that 'both sides of the coin' had to be put forward on the economic and environmental aspects and asked if any Member had any objection to the contents of the draft response.

11. Cllr. Majumdar responded that she objected to two main points in the draft response.

### **Question 5 – “Disregards”**

It was the view of the LB Ealing, which it was envisaged would be the viewpoint of many of the other local authorities, that all of the take-offs and arrivals during the night, which were not scheduled to be night movements should not be “disregarded”. They should be counted against the Quota and adjusted later in the Season, or in a subsequent Season to make up for them.

It should not be permissible, as had occurred in the Summer, for aeroplanes to continue to fly regardless, due to the fact of bad weather or Swanwick ‘going down’, without any impact on what the airport was allowed to do later on.

Cllr. Majumdar believed that the response should not state that the Committee were content with the arrangements for “disregards”.

## **Appendix B**

This response was found to be very partial, mainly because it made no mention whatsoever to the economic cost to the community, as discussed at the July HACC meeting, of night flights and the disturbance to thousands of people on the ground and the effect on their work the following day.

Cllr. Majumdar said it was also difficult to agree with the statistics quoted in the Paper, e.g. 40% of all BAA long-haul flights arrived before 07.00 hrs. but night flights only count up to 06.00 hrs.

It was believed that the local authorities’ represented on the Committee could not support Appendix B being included as part of the HACC submission.

12. Paul Ellis understood there were a number of conflicting views on this subject He spoke on behalf of the airlines and the broader community and had issued a number of amendments to the draft response to commend to the Committee, to incorporate on balance, in the final response.

On specifics of Appendix B, the Members had been requested to produce information on the economic benefits which had been done.

Paul Ellis said he would have no objection if other Members also wished to include items along the lines as described by Cllr. Majumdar in order to retain the balance, as long as the points raised by the users and the airlines were fully included in the response of the economic benefits. He did not think there would be a consensus view reached by the Members.

13. The Technical Adviser pointed out that Appendix B was submitted to the Committee and produced in its entirety, because at the last two HACC meetings held to discuss the Night Flights consultation document, the IATA representative and the London Chamber of Commerce representative were invited to submit to the Committee their views on what the economic benefits of night flights were.

The document as laid before the Committee, was in fact as they had been requested to put forward, with the assessment of the economic benefits of night flights. The Department for Transport had specifically asked those who were to respond, to include this information as there was a shortage of such data.

14. Philip Carlisle said that if the response was to be ‘balanced’, this should mean neutral. If all the parties around the table with an interest, had and would make their own submissions, however partial or impartial they may be, those submissions on their own would do the job.

There would seem to be no point in the Committee putting its name to a response which had tried to be balanced and would not change any factor. It might be better to admit that the Committee was a group of counter organisations and although from time to time can agree on an issue, if on this item, an agreement could not be reached, it would appear to be a waste of time to try and solve the problem

The Committee had asked for the proof of the economic benefits in relation to night flights, hence the reason for the tabled statistics.

15. Rob Gibson agreed with Philip Carlisle that the Members would never reach a consensus on such a 'thorny' issue as night flights.

In relation to the specific issue of Appendix B, he said that he was sure that the Government was well aware of the Oxford Economic Forecasting (OEF) Report of 1999 that this was based on. It was believed that this was the Report that BAA originally commissioned and the Government used to assist deliberations on the SERAS Report. The Government must be aware of the contents of the Report, and it was not thought that it would add anything for the Committee to sign up to it, when it had obviously caused quite a lot of difficulties for a certain number of Members from the local authorities and LAANC.

The Chairman responded that paragraph 8 did state that the Committee would submit the Appendix to the Department for Transport, subject to the agreement of the Members.

16. The Chairman stated that when the debate commenced several months ago, he made a note even before the Paper was discussed that *'consensus was impossible, some Members were in favour of a total ban on night flights, but that was unrealistic. The only general agreement reached was that whatever conventions were agreed on quotas, shoulder periods etc. there should be a lesser impact on residents than the current position as a general principle, and all this should be justified by economic and operational benefits'*.

The Members agreed with this statement.

17. Roy Featherstone said he had not seen statistics as to when the 'extra flights' would come in to Heathrow. Would the timing be before 6.30 a.m. or late at night in actual terms.

The Technical Adviser responded that the proposal was such that any 'extra flights' would be included in the Noise Quota period which was 23.30 hrs. – 06.00 hrs.

18. Gareth Harper stated that HACAN/Clearskies were not happy with Appendix B. There were some useful objective data included, but there was also tendentious argument. A clear indication had been picked up that the industry expected an increase both in passenger demand for night flights, but also an increase for cargo demand. The question was put to industry if they had agreed with the Department for Transport forecast of the increase in numbers over the next six years.

Paul Ellis responded that he had not seen any forecasts relating to this.

The consultation document had set out a proposal that the demand would be much greater. If the numbers were calculated, the proposal by the end of the peak period of 2012 would increase the allowed number of movements in the Night Quota period from an average of 16 per night to 17 ½, e.g. a 1½ movements per night increase.

In Appendix B, it had been stated that an increase in the number of movements was expected during the Night Quota period. The question was reiterated, what was the level of demand that was expected over the next six years, greater than, or less than the numbers that had been put forward by the Department for Transport.

19. Cllr. Ceaser requested that a response be submitted on behalf of the Members of the Committee along the lines of that which the Chairman had suggested in (Minute 17) and this was seconded by Philip Carlisle. It would be absurd if the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee did not respond to the Consultation.

This was agreed.

#### **2959 HEATHROW AIRPORT INTERIM MASTER PLAN – CONSULTATION DRAFT**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser with draft reply to consultation (**HACC 436**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman stated that the deadline for the submission of a response was 31st October 2005. To date, no response had been received from Member organisations in writing. It was therefore suggested that another couple of weeks be afforded to the Members to consider whether they wished to submit a response to the Secretariat.

Following this, it was proposed that a meeting of the General Purposes Sub-Committee be held in order to finalise the matter and draft a response on behalf of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee by the end of the month.

It was important that the Committee had some views on the BAA Heathrow Airport Interim Draft Interim Master Plan.

The meeting was open to any Member of HACC to attend and was not limited to the Members of the General Purposes Sub-Committee. However, any Member who wished to add their name to the list of Membership for this Sub-Committee on a permanent basis, should contact the Secretary.

This was agreed.

**(Secretary's Note):** The meeting has been scheduled to be held between 11.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m. on Wednesday 19th October 2005, in the Windsor Suite at the Renaissance Hotel, Bath Road, Heathrow.

## **2960 RECOVERY OF EXPENDITURE ON NEW RUNWAY CAPACITY AT STANSTED AIRPORT**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 437**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) as the Regulator of BAA's finances did undertake a consultation in June 2004 and thought that they had included the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee amongst their consultees' in the normal procedure. Unfortunately, this was not the case as there are two Heathrow Consultative Committees. They had written to the Secretariat earlier this year requesting confirmation that the HACC had not replied to the 2004 consultation. However, the Secretariat had not received any previous notification of this consultation.

In finalising the matter, knowledge of the other Committees had come to light. The Stansted and Gatwick Consultative Committees were in the same position, as there were Airline Committees with the same name at those respective airports.

Ultimately, the Civil Aviation Authority accepted the situation and changed the names by which they described the Airline Committees, whilst the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee retained its correct title as far as they were concerned.

Last year, the CAA put out the consultation and they had concluded in January 2005 that a decision had been reached and that BAA would pay the first £100 million of the cost running up to the construction of a runway at Heathrow, but the CAA would then carry out a further consultation which would tie in with its review of BAA's finances as to how the further charges for the construction of that runway would be met.

The airlines at Heathrow had stated that they would be reluctant to pay towards a runway at Stansted and the airlines at Stansted believed that the proposals were 'gold-plated and they did not require anything quite so fancy'.

In the circumstances, it would be appropriate for the Committee to support the user and airline views, as set out in the final two paragraphs of the report (**HACC 437**).

The Technical Adviser commended this for support, as the Committee response to the Civil Aviation Authority.

3. Roger Wiltshire spoke as a representative for a number of UK airlines, including those that operated at Heathrow, those only operating at Gatwick and those with a small operation at Stansted.

He re-emphasised the point regarding the airlines' objections on the cross-funding of Stansted development. The true cross-subsidy is much larger than the figures being floated publicly over the last few months and is very significant in the low-fare, short-haul market.

He was therefore unable to support the beginning of paragraph 12 as the response suggested in the Technical Advisers report. Also, there would appear to be a conflict between sub-paragraphs (a) and (c) of paragraph 12..

The Chairman asked Roger Wiltshire if he disagreed with the Recommendation in paragraph 14 that would be put forward in the response letter from HACC. Paragraphs 12 and 13 would not be submitted.

Roger Wiltshire replied that he had no objection to the Recommendation in paragraph 14.

## **2961 CIVIL AVIATION BILL**

1. Note (September 2005) by the Department for Transport to outline the purpose of the Bill had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. David Gray said the Note circulated was to provide an update on the progress of the Civil Aviation Bill and to be used as a reference for further reading material and to provide some further clarification on the purpose of Clauses 2 and 3 on which it was understood the Committee had substantive discussion in July
3. The Technical Adviser referred back to the discussion on the proposed draft response on Night Flights, there was a reference to the fact that the Civil Aviation Bill proposed to give the Government powers to abolish the movement limits at airports, unless it was amended. There had been a number of expressions of concern on this proposal. It could conceivably allow the Government to permit 24-hour operations at airports.

It was believed that the Members would wish to express their concern on this. Accordingly, reference to this would be made in the response to the Department for Transport on behalf of the Committee, unless the Members collectively decided otherwise.

4. Paul Ellis said that it was very important that the proper incentive to introducing quieter aircraft within a specific noise limit was met and the Government would be right to move in that direction.

The Technical Adviser reiterated that it was the movement limit that it was proposed the Government would have powers to abolish, not the noise Quota limit, which would still remain.

5. Cllr. Majumdar stated that as she and many other Members had previously declared at HACC meetings, a movement limit was absolutely essential, particularly at night. It would be a total disaster if the movement limit was removed.

The Technical Adviser believed that the proposal was still at the stage where it would be dealt with by the House of Lords before it went back to the Commons.

If the Committee wished to make a representation on this, it would need to do this to the Chairman of the Committee which was considering it in the House of Lords.

6. David Gray said as the first stage explained, the Civil Aviation Bill was due for its Third Reading in the Commons on 10th October 2005 and then would move across to the House of Lords for its due Parliamentary process and views could be fed into this.
7. The Chairman asked the Members if they were in agreement that the Technical Adviser could submit a representation on behalf of the Committee.

This was agreed.

**2962 PROJECT FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF HEATHROW (PSDH)**

1. Update report by the Department for Transport on the work of the Technical Groups had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. David Gray said the report updated the Committee Members on key progress areas since the July meeting, in particular, it would be noted on Air Quality, that the work that had been occupying the Technical Panels during the past year was now coming to its conclusion. There would be a major meeting in October 2005 to pull all the findings together.

The fourth bullet point described the arrangements that had been set for a Peer Review process and the personnel involved, the remit being to review the work of the Technical Panels and report on whether their work had been unbiased and fair in terms of establishing a technical basis for the DfT to carry out future assessments of air quality impacts.

The report also gave an update on 'mixed-mode' issues where a point of reasonable maturity was soon to be reached in terms of the feasibility work carried out by NATS which would provide the basis for substantive scenario testing on noise and air quality in the coming months.

An update on surface access, road and rail issues was also covered.

David Gray added that during the last month, most of the work carried out by the Department for Transport was to ensure that appropriate modelling tools were available in order to submit various possible scenarios at Heathrow to proper assessment.

3. Cllr. Ceaser referred to rail access, particularly as far as Airtrack was concerned. It had been noted that any reports commissioned by the Strategic Rail Authority had now been delivered. It would appear there were issues as to how this might be progressed and funded.

As Leader of the local authority, (Spelthorne) whose area this would be put through, the question was asked if information could be provided on this immediately, or could an assurance be given that Spelthorne would be kept up-to-date as appropriate.

David Gray replied that a copy of the report had been copied to the Airtrack Forum, but at this stage no further detail could be added on the funding issues as these were still a matter for consideration.

Cllr. Ceaser said he was not convinced that Spelthorne were part of the Airtrack Forum, although it was believed that they were observers on it. A request was made that a copy of the report that had been sent to Airtrack, was made available to Spelthorne. as they had not had the opportunity to see this.

### **2963 RE-DIRECTION OF TRAFFIC - EASTERN PERIMETER ROAD AND CLOSURE OF EASTCHURCH ROAD CROSSING**

1. Closure of Eastchurch Road crossing and re-direction of all traffic to the Eastern Perimeter Road. A presentation by Ben Sharp, BAA Development Manager was made to the Members (*enclosed*).
2. A map of the Eastern Perimeter Road Widening Project was circulated to the Members.

#### **Objectives**

- Heathrow Airport Limited was spending £7.8 million upgrading and improving the Eastern Perimeter Road. This would improve road safety and provide a dedicated cycle lane around the Eastern Perimeter.
- The reason for the works is to allow the Eastchurch Crossing to be closed.
- Closing the crossing will enhance the security of the airfield, reduce the traffic congestion and delays caused by the operation of the Crossing gates, and allow the uninterrupted movement of aircraft and tugs between the eastern maintenance base and the airfield.

#### **Crossing Closure**

- There would be two temporary road closures over the next couple of months to allow construction to take place on the existing roads.
- Cranford Lane South which leads in to the Southern end of the British Airways maintenance base will be closed for 12 weeks.
- The stretch at the Northern end between the car parks complex and the Eastern Business Park will be closed
- Once complete the roads will be capable of taking a larger volume of traffic than at present.
- The Eastchurch Road will be permanently closed to all traffic, between South of the Enfield Roundabout and North of the Eastchurch Roundabout.
- The permanent closure of Eastchurch Road will take place at the end of 2005.
- The new stretch of road currently being created will be called 'Envoy Avenue'

Following on from this presentation, Members asked questions/responded.

3. Cllr. Bennett pointed out that the Eastchurch Road was currently a bus route. He asked what would happen to the buses?

Ben Sharp replied that the buses would also be routed around the Eastern Perimeter Road with the rest of the traffic. The buses would travel from Hatton Cross to the Enfield Road Roundabout and take a longer route around the Eastern Perimeter Road, instead of picking up the Eastchurch Road. There would be a consultation with Transport for London.

4. John Gurney asked if a study had been undertaken of the traffic flow. The traffic would be transferred to the 'Magic Roundabout', whereas previously, the traffic could split and go in two directions, it would only be able to travel on one road. Currently, due to the Bus Station at Hatton Cross, the traffic light exit where the vehicles turned out, all the way around onto the A30, congestion was evident.. Buses could not get in or out of the Bus Station. This occurred on a daily basis.

With the proposals of the road closure, there would be no choice available for drivers of taking an alternative route. All the traffic would be travelling down to the East side. It was stated that the grid-locking of the traffic needed to be addressed.

The problem had worsened during the past two months as 'Dunlop' had hired out their premises to a hire company, 'Speedway', who were regularly reversing their lorries in, causing a build-up of traffic. It was not ideal to lease the property to such a company.

Ben Sharp replied that the volume of traffic travelling around the 'Magic Roundabout' would not change as a result of the proposed closure scheme. The traffic would be coming off a different 'leg' of that roundabout.

Basically, the remit of the project was for the section of road closures as outlined. However, it had proved necessary to take into account a scheme, where the road would be as congestion-free as possible, which is the reason for the two lanes at the roundabout, as opposed to one all the way around. Modelling work had been undertaken in that area. It was accepted that further issues needed to be addressed at the Hatton Cross roundabout, but unfortunately could not be changed as a result of the road closure project.

5. Andy Hull pointed out that the distance by road looked to be twice what it was currently. He asked if a calculation had been established on the total of the environmental cost of that, or was this compensated for by a lack of stationary traffic when the roads were closed.

Ben Sharp responded that a calculation had been made and he would say that the latter was true, as it would be a fact that there would not be a queue of stationary traffic.

6. Paul Ellis asked if it was known how many times per day the Eastchurch Road Crossing was closed. Would the Crossing remain available for exceptional circumstances during the course of the project e.g. a serious accident on the Eastern Perimeter Road.

Ben Sharp replied that this was approximately 40-50 times per day. This should prove quite a saving when it was closed. The Northern fence that would be erected would have an abnormal load entrance which would allow for example, vehicles such as engines into the maintenance base and other abnormal loads onto the airport. However, it would not be used for any other purpose.

7. Keith Harlow asked if the project had been deemed to accommodate current traffic or had extra capacity been built in.

Ben Sharp replied that the project had been calculated for traffic load up to 2012.

8. Peter Viggers asked if provision had been made for extra buses to be available, to allow for the additional travelling time it would take passengers to get around the new road.

Ben Sharp replied that it was not in the remit of the project to allow for extra buses. This matter had been discussed with Transport for London. The journey time should be more reliable.

#### **2964 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.
2. The Chairman asked the Chairman of the PSSC, Philip Carlisle, to inform the Committee of any issues arising from the meeting held on the morning of 25th July 2005 that would be of interest to the Committee.
3. Philip Carlisle referred to the subject of Taxis. The Committee might remember that a Taxi Working Group had been set up, the Members of which were from the PSSC. An agreement had been reached with Heathrow Airport Limited that one of three Members of the PSSC would attend the Taxi Liaison Group meetings which were the occasions when the Taxi industry talked to Heathrow Airport Limited, the Police and the Public Carriage Office (PCO). The Member would then feedback to the PSSC, who would in turn update the Members of HACC, rather than have the existence of the Taxi Working Group, which had been under-used.

It was hoped that by March 2006, there would be more positive news to report back to the Committee.

#### **2965 NTK WORKING GROUP**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 18th May 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

## ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

### 2966 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report and Borough Noise Line Figures for April to July 2005 (Quarter 2) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Cllr .Bennett said he was concerned that the report indicated by his calculation, an increase in complaints of over 30%.

Nita Easey responded that there were several reasons for the increase in the number of complaints reported.

Traditionally, complaints increased in the Summer, particularly in hot and humid weather, as doors and windows were kept open. The perception and awareness by people of aircraft was greater at this time.

Easterly operations and the disruption caused at Swanwick was also a contributory factor, in addition to maintenance runway work that had been carried out at Heathrow. It was therefore quite normal to see a 'blip' in the figures from time to time.

People also had the subject of the 'Night Flights' consultation in their minds and their awareness of aircraft was further noticeable.

It should not be taken that the figures would be a precedent for the future. There would be 'peaks and troughs'.

3. Cllr .Majumdar stated that more people would be disturbed by take-offs to the East of the airport. This should be borne in mind by the Department for Transport when considering the Westerly Preference.
4. Roger Wiltshire made an observation that the big difference from year to year was on departures, although he did not know in what direction. Some incidents of disruptive days were followed by late departures. It may be that these individual events contributed to the figures in the report.

Nita Easey responded that this finding was one of the points she had mentioned. On occasions, a combination of events would occur and a 'jump' in the number of complaints would be apparent. However, the long-term trend was that complaints had decreased, other than when other factors came into play e.g. runway resurfacing.

5. Rob Gibson referred to the second page of the report where an issue on Concorde had been reported.

Nita Easey explained that the current reporting system had been in existence for some time and therefore the categories were still listed, as people historically wished to look back. However, there was the odd occasion when a resident would allege that Concorde had flown, when in fact it was a military aircraft or similar.

The report was based on the complaints received as heard, not the actual position when investigated.

6. Andy Hull observed there had been a major increase in complaints from the LB Richmond on Thames.

Cllr. Bennett responded that the LB Richmond had a very efficient recording system at the Town Hall.

#### **2967 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for July and August 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. The Chairman referred to the '*Existing N3 Car park and Longford Meadows Park, Western Perimeter Road, Heathrow Airport*' where a Planning Application for a total of 1,430 parking spaces had been submitted. It would be noted that these had to be included within the airport car park cap limit.

Mike Forster clarified that this provision had always been included within the T5 scheme of the multi-storey 42,000 cap, but would just be re-positioned elsewhere.

#### **2968 NEWS RELEASES**

1. News Releases were circulated with the Agenda for information and were noted.
2. John Gurney pointed out that there had still been no further update given on the closure of the petrol station at the South-West corner of the airport, by the Cargo Village. This had been closed to drivers for some considerable time and was a loss.

Mike Forster responded that he would investigate and report back on his findings.

#### **2969 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Cllr. Bennet referred to the South West rail service announcement coming into Feltham and wished to report that it was poorly worded. It stated that it was a 'coach/rail connection to Heathrow' when in fact it was just a normal service bus.

He suggested that South West Trains should be contacted to request that the announcement should make it clear that it was just a bus service, and might even give the number, which was the route 285.

For a passenger who had never used the service before, the announcement was misleading and should be made absolutely clear.

The Chairman requested that the Secretary address this issue. This was agreed.

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

#### **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

**WEDNESDAY 7<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2005 (SEMINAR)**

**DATES OF 2006 MEETINGS:**

**WEDNESDAY 25<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2006**

**WEDNESDAY 29<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2006**

**WEDNESDAY 24<sup>th</sup> MAY 2006**

**WEDNESDAY 26<sup>th</sup> JULY 2006**

**WEDNESDAY 27<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2006**

**WEDNESDAY 6<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2006 (SEMINAR)**

