

## HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the Business Meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2005 at The Renaissance Hotel, Heathrow

#### PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Ajmer Dhillon	-	LB of Hounslow
Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Digby Jacks	-	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 Turrell	-	Bracknell BC
Cllr. Rodney Bennett	-	LB Richmond upon Thames
Cllr. Christopher Knight	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos	-	Surrey CC
Cllr. Gerry Ceaser	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Martine Hyams (Deputy)	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Malcolm Beer	-	RB of Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Anne Whitehead	-	Association of London Government
Peter Viggers	-	EANAG
John Gurney	-	TUC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Donald Gregory	-	Independent
David Gray	-	Department for Transport

#### HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Janis Kong	-	Executive Chairman
Mike Forster	-	Business Strategy Director
Ben Morton	-	Director of Communications

#### APOLOGIES:

##### Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

Keith Harlow (Independent), Cllr. Bill Lidgate (Deputy) (Bucks CC).

#### 2970 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28th September 2005 were agreed.

## **2971 MATTERS ARISING**

1. John Gurney referred to Minute 2951 (5) relating to the request for a presentation to be made to the Committee on the A380's noise footprint and asked if there was an update available yet.

Ben Morton responded that it was still too early for a presentation to be brought to the Committee as tests were still being undertaken by Airbus.

2. John Gurney referred to Minute 2968 (2) and asked if there was an update available yet on the closure of the petrol station on the South-West corner of the airport, near to the Cargo Village.

Ben Morton replied that he was not a party to the investigation into this.

This action would be carried forward, as Mike Forster had undertaken to investigate and report back on his findings to the Committee.

## **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

### **2972 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT**

1. **Committee Membership** – Letters had been received from **Bucks County Council** confirming that Cllr. Peter Roberts had been replaced as representative on the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee by Cllr. Rodney Royston with Cllr. Bill Lidgate as Deputy and **South Bucks District Council** confirming that Cllr. Gary Edwards had been replaced as representative on the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee by Cllr. Dev Dhillon with Cllr. Alan Oxley as Deputy.

### **2973 BAA HEATHROW 'COMMUNITY BUILDINGS NOISE INSULATION SCHEME'**

1. In response to the Government's White Paper on '*The Future of Aviation*' and after consulting with local people, BAA Heathrow is setting up a community-led body to administer this voluntary scheme.

Six voluntary Board Members are required to represent community interests. Applicants must demonstrate that they are able to work well with people from other communities. Preference would be given to applications from residents who lived within the scheme boundary and particularly, from those who have some form of responsibility for community buildings in the area. Details of the scheme, including a map of the area where the scheme applies, were sent to HACC Members in August. Alternatively, Members could look at [www.heathrowairport.com/communitybuildings](http://www.heathrowairport.com/communitybuildings).

A letter from BAA Heathrow inviting applications and a copy of the advertisement placed in the local Press had been circulated with the Agenda. Interested applicants were asked to refer to these.

Members who were interested in applying for a position as a Board Member, were requested to bring a written application to the Business Meeting in the first instance, where Applications would be debated and a nomination put forward to BAA Heathrow.

2. The Chairman reported that the Secretary had not received any advance notice of intention to apply for the position from Members and asked if anybody had an interest on serving on this Board. The closing date for applications was 9th December 2005.

Cllr. Gerry Ceaser volunteered to serve on the Board for the community led body, on behalf of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

The Chairman asked if the Members agreed to this nomination.

This was agreed.

**2974 BRITISH AIRWAYS “CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY REPORT 2005”**

This was the background to a Seminar presentation during the afternoon from Andrew Sentance, Chief Economist & Head of Environmental Affairs, British Airways.

**2975 BAA HEATHROW “FLIGHT EVALUATION REPORT 2004/2005”**

1. Notification was given that this report had now been published and was available on the BAA website.
2. Virginia Godfrey suggested that a map showing the location of complaints be included in future editions of this report when they were published.
3. The Technical Adviser reminded the Committee that the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group received such a map, which could be circulated to the Members with any data that BAA published on an annual basis.

**2976 TRANSPORT FOR LONDON - REVISED PROPOSAL FOR LATER RUNNING OF THE TUBE**

1. Transport for London letter dated November for information and copy of original HACC response had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

The views of the Committee were invited for a response to Transport for London on the public consultation results. The closing date for the consultation response was 12th December 2005.

2. The Chairman stated that the Members would note from the letter, that TfL were now developing an option for a possible half-an-hour later finish on Friday and Saturday night and a one-hour later start on Saturday morning, with no change to the Sunday morning programme. However, it was believed that the Committee would still be unhappy with this proposal.
3. The Technical Adviser said that the Passenger Services Sub-Committee had debated this matter at the meeting on the morning of 7th December 2005. Members had looked at the grounds which the Committee had sent to Transport for London, listing out their reasons why the Members were opposed to the proposal for a later running of the Tube in the evening.
4. Cllr Khursheed stated that passengers had expressed concern as to how they will get in to Heathrow early morning at weekends, should the TfL proposals be agreed.

5. Cllr Bennett said that at a recent Transport Liaison Committee meeting he attended, a representative from TfL was present. It was apparent that it was the Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone, driving this proposal through, not Transport for London.
6. The Chairman said that the Committee had to be conscious of the staff working at Heathrow and passengers who needed to catch early morning flights from the airport.
7. Cllr. Bennett stated that if the public were asked if they would like a later running of the Tube, the majority of people would say, yes. However, the knock-on effect had not been properly explained.
8. The Chairman asked if the Committee endorsed the original proposal submitted to Transport for London by HACC.

The Members agreed that the original proposal submitted on behalf of HACC should be endorsed.

9. BAA also were concerned at the proposal to change the Tube timetable at weekends.

**2977 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 28th September 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.

**2978 GENERAL PURPOSES SUB-COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Sub-Committee held on 19th October 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.

**2979 NTK WORKING GROUP**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 14th September 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.
2. Cllr. Ceaser spoke on behalf of the members of the Local Authorities' Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC) who had expressed concern in relation to the organisational and staffing changes that were occurring at BAA.

A letter had been despatched by the HACC Secretary on 9th November 2005 to all NTKWG members, alerting members to the intended internal changes that were taking place within BAA, which had resulted in the cancellation of the NTKWG meeting on 23rd November 2005.

The concern of LAANC was that possibly, due to the internal changes, this would result in the break-up of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group.

The September NTKWG minutes had indicated that at the November meeting, the members were due to receive a follow-up presentation on the results of the mobile noise monitoring at Cranford from Ian Flindell, Noise Consultant.

An assurance was sought from BAA and other stakeholders that the January 2006 NTKWG meeting would proceed, with continued support to the local communities.

Cllr. Ceaser thought it was difficult to believe that BAA had chosen this time, with so many noise related issues to address in the coming months, to apparently reduce its support and commitment to this area of work.

Mrs. Kong said that Cllr. Ceaser had raised a series of questions.

Firstly, with regard to the organisational changes within BAA and the personnel. All BAA operational teams, including Nita Easey, Jane Dawes and colleagues were currently away for assessment. No decision had yet been made as to their future. It was appreciated this was an unsettling period of time.

Mrs. Kong said she was well aware of the importance of the groups, both to the local communities and to BAA, especially at this moment with the ongoing noise issues.

Due to the organisational and staffing changes, it was not possible to tell what the new structure would look like, as no decision had yet been made with regard to the team. However, it would be designed to give the necessary support to the local communities.

Mrs. Kong said in relation to the January 2006 NTKWG meeting, as far as BAA were concerned, there was no reason why this should not go ahead. However, this would be addressed separately.

As to the future of the NTKWG Sub-Committee, BAA had the 'machinery' in place for consultation.

3. Cllr. Beer said that part of the problem was that 'mixed messages' had been received by residents with regard to the availability of the mapping system of the record of previous flights, be it a day record or a short-term record of one particular flight. Some people have said that the service had been reduced, others had been unable to access it and told that it was no longer supplied.

Cllr. Beer had raised this matter at a NTKWG meeting earlier in the year and had been told that it was still freely available. However the operational fact would prove that it was not. This matter still needed to be addressed.

Mrs. Kong replied that as far as she was concerned, residents still had access to all the available BAA data.

4. Cllr. Beer added that there had been in existence a very good system that plotted the aircraft flight paths which could be accessed for particular periods. However, what seemed to be available now was only a typical day's activity, un-dated, and it was difficult to get any valuable information from this.

Ben Morton responded that he was not aware of this. Four members of his team had spent a lot of time dealing with such information. He would investigate this matter. There was a lot of work being undertaken by BAA to improve the area of noise communications, in addition to staff at the end of the telephone to answer the queries of the residents within the community.

5. Cllr. Beer pointed out that there had also been some mention by local residents that BAA were reluctant to issue such information, because potential terrorists might use the data to plot a record of current flights.

Mrs. Kong responded that in terms of people making requests from their house, with a valid postcode, the level of access of available information remained the same. As regards terrorism, and being able to plot, such people would request widespread information, further out than their postcode and it would not be seen why anyone would need access to such data.

6. Cllr. Beer added that as for local authorities, who might request data, they would not only quote postcodes, they would have a general interest in a wider area.

Mrs. Kong replied, that in this instance, BAA would not have a reason to hide any information from local authorities. If it was a case of poring over data, a visit to the BAA offices might be a preferable solution, rather than information being despatched through the post.

7. Cllr. Ceaser pointed out that it had been reported that the 'Hotline' for information was invariably engaged or unanswered.

Ben Morton said that he had not heard this criticism previously. The team had increased in number to man the telephones and deal with enquiries from the local residents, but this point would be addressed.

## **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

### **2980 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT**

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report Figures for July to September 2005 and LB Richmond-upon-Thames Noise Line Figures for July to September 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Cllr. Bennett stated that he had been trying to get the reference to Concorde removed.
3. Cllr. Bennett also queried why the area of Barnes had such a high percentage of complaint calls, being 76.0% of the total. There was no obvious answer to this.

**2981 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE**

Report from BAA Heathrow Flight Evaluation Team for the period Summer 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

**2982 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for October and November 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. The Chairman stated that the Technical Adviser had referred to the Planning Application for week ending 11th November 2005, relating to the South Eastern part of the airfield where a major reconfiguration of the taxiway systems would take place. The question was asked if that would impact on noise conditions or otherwise.

Major Reconfiguration of Taxiway System (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 18 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995).

*'Phase 2 of the Eastern Apron redevelopment project. To provide a revised taxiway and stand layout in the Eastern Apron following closure of the crosswind runway'.*

The Chairman requested that a presentation be given to the members at a future HACC meeting.

Mrs. Kong responded that this subject would be covered in the presentation to be given at the HACC Seminar by Mike Forster, BAA Strategy Director on the 'Heathrow East Development'.

3. Cllr. Khursheed asked if this was the first Planning Application as part of the redevelopment recently announced by BAA.

Mrs. Kong replied that it was a clearance for that, but not part of it. Essentially, the idea was to close the crosswind runway and re-align the taxiways which are North/South parallel. Plans to carry out this work had been determined a long time before BAA had decided what to do with Terminal 2. It was a tidying up of the Taxiways to get them into a box shape, rather than the Star of David configuration.

**2983 PRESS & NEWS RELEASES**

BAA Traffic Figures for September and October 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

**2984 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

1. John Gurney referred to a point raised at the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting in the morning, relating to the length of validity of the ID passes. Concern had been expressed as it had become apparent that there was now in circulation both 30-day passes and 60-day passes.

The Technical Adviser added that the BAA representative present at the PSSC meeting was not clear herself, as to the clarity of the situation. However, it had been found that some Members of the Sub-Committee held passes which ran for 30 days which then became 'parked' if they were not used in that time, whilst other Members had 60-day passes. It left the Members unsure as to whether they needed to make a visit to get the passes re-validated as they entered one of the terminal security areas, or not.

Mrs. Kong replied that the passes were not 60-day passes, but permanent passes. There was no such thing as a 60-day or 30-day pass. The standard rule was 60 days before a pass was 'parked' no matter what pass was held. This was a Government arrangement which applied to everybody.

The Members were asked to accept that it was a 60-day ruling. If the ruling had changed, Mrs. Kong would inform the Committee as soon as possible.

2. Peter Viggers referred to the Air Transport movements and wished to warn BAA that the figures were creeping up over 470,000 per annum. It would not take many more to reach the 480,000 cap.

Mrs. Kong commented that it was about time something was happening on this. She had assured the Committee that BAA had a process in place to make sure that the 480,000 cap was not breached significantly before the T5 order came in.

3. Cllr. Bishop referred to the request made for statistics relating to air quality, upon which the construction of a third runway would be dependent, as to whether the pollution level had increased or decreased.

Previously, the Committee had been informed it was probably the same level, but unless the statistics were seen in writing from the monitoring stations around the airport, the trend would not be known.

Mrs. Kong replied that BAA were very clear about this matter and monitored the situation very closely. The website dedicated to this subject was very open and honest in its findings, although some people had said that it was complicated to use.

4. Rob Gibson said he had been in conversation with the Secretary on the air quality report he had committed to provide to the Committee, which he undertook to try to bring to the next HACC meeting.
5. The Technical Adviser reminded the members that Mrs. Kong had assured the Committee some months ago that they could obtain a copy of the BAA quarterly report on air monitoring. This had recently been received into the HACC office. It was a somewhat technical report and some of it the Technical Adviser needed advice on. This report would be made available to the Members of the Committee, although they too, may also find some difficulty in understanding various aspects of it and it may not be helpful.

The subject of air quality would be covered in the 'Project for the Sustainable Development at Heathrow' (PSDH) presentation by David Gray (DfT) at the Seminar. However, as this was an ongoing project, and the monitoring fluctuated, it might be some time before anybody could establish a definitive answer as to what the situation was and the forecasts were likely to be.

It may be that as Rob Gibson was very much involved in this subject, that he could write a Paper in 'laymans' language intended for the Members of the Committee to make them somewhat wiser than they were currently.

6. Mrs. Kong stated that if the monitoring had indicated that Heathrow was around the 40 level, this was exactly the same as the level that was required for the European limit. It was impacted by the M25, the M4 and future growth. To take on board modelling for Terminal 6, the third runway and mixed-mode, coupled with growth in the future, and yet keep the air quality at the same level, showed the magnitude of the task.
7. Don Gregory stated that at the last HACC meeting, the question was raised with Mrs. Kong as to whether BAA supported the congestion charge, the reply to which it was understood was yes, on the basis of not on congestion so much, as on air pollution. From a passenger services point of view, it was not certain that people would currently support that idea. The question was asked if there was another way around this.

Mrs. Kong replied that whilst this was appreciated from the view-point of the passenger, similarly, people needed to look at it from a long-term point of view, if they wanted a range of frequent destinations out of Heathrow. Obviously, all factors would need to be taken into consideration.

In order to achieve the right level of air quality to make growth at Heathrow, there was a whole cocktail of issues, one of which was congestion charging.

8. The Chairman referred to an article in 'The Times' dated 7th December 2005 that Mrs. Kong wished to comment on.

Mrs. Kong read verbatim from the press article which was entitled 'Noise Fears as Ministers Abandon Flight Limit at Heathrow'.

She said that the article had no truth in it at all. The article was full of inaccuracies.

However, the quote from Duncan Bonfield, BAA Corporate Affairs Director was acceptable.

"Next year's consultation should certainly look at lifting the flights cap. Heathrow is a strategically important national asset and getting more people to use it is good for the British economy, but that has to be balanced against the interests of people under the flight path. This has got to be a Government decision, not one made by BAA".

9. Virginia Godfrey asked Mrs. Kong what was the position of BAA.

Mrs. Kong replied BAA had made the position quite clear that the economic driver was significant. Provision of the extra capacity would require very little investment. However, BAA were well aware of how important this matter was to the local community. All of these factors had to be taken in the balance. BAA would give all the technical information to the Government for the consultation next year.

10. Virginia Godfrey asked if this was not somewhat a change from the previous position of BAA, which was heard at the Terminal 5 Inquiry, when it was stated that they were supportive of alternation. The question was asked if this did this not go against the previous submission.

Mrs. Kong replied that this was similar to the position in relation to the third runway, when BAA had stipulated clear points to the Government which it chose to ignore. The Government had then published its White Paper.

The Government had changed the rules and BAA had now changed its position. All the statements made at the Terminal 5 Inquiry were related to judgments made on technical, operational and environmental aspects at that time.

However, as the Committee had previously been reminded, there were some very significant environmental hurdles to overcome.

The quote that Duncan Bonfield had made was correct. The remainder of the article was inaccurate.

11. David Gray responded by saying that it was not a question of the Government 'changing the rules'. In his T5 Decision Letter in 2001, the Secretary of State had expressly declined to comment on the merits of any further expansion of Heathrow, saying that this was properly a matter for the (then) forthcoming policy review i.e. the White Paper.
12. Cllr. Bishop referred to the recent news item on the revolutionary new travel pod which could take a capacity of four people and asked if there was further details available.

Mrs. Kong replied that the pod was very neat. It was like a driverless taxi, which went through a selection of pre-programmed destinations. It could only travel on dedicated tracks. It could take a capacity of four passengers with space for baggage in the middle. It was a prototype on trial.

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

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

**WEDNESDAY 25th JANUARY 2006**