

## HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### Minutes of meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2006 at Heathrow Point West

#### PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Margaret Majumdar	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. David Bishop	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Ajmer Dhillon	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Digby Jacks	-	LB Hounslow
Rob Gibson	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Jim Maddan	-	LB Wandsworth
Cllr. Rodney Bennett	-	LB Richmond upon Thames
Cllr. Bill Lidgate	-	Bucks CC
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Gerry Ceaser	-	Spelthorne BC
Richard Barnes	-	London Assembly
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Peter Viggers	-	EANAG
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Philip Carlisle	-	GTMC
John Gurney	-	TUC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
Lynette Braithwaite	-	AUC
Andy Hull	-	Independent

#### OTHERS:

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

#### HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Mick Temple	-	Divisional Director
Mike Forster	-	Director of Business Strategy
Ben Morton	-	Director of Communications

#### APOLOGIES:

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

Maurice Hudson (Technical Adviser), Tabitha Stebbings (BAA), Cllr. Chris Turrell (Bracknell Forest BC), Brian Yates (Consumers' Association), Keith Harlow (Independent), Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos (Surrey County Council), Cllr. Victor Argawal (Surrey County Council), Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Windsor & Maidenhead BC), Frank Wingate (Future Heathrow), Don Gregory (Independent).

2. The Chairman welcomed Lynette Braithwaite to her first meeting of the Committee, as the newly appointed representative from the Airport Users' Council (AUC).
3. The Chairman announced that Cllr. Digby Jacks had informed him that the March meeting would be his last attendance at HACC. He did not propose to stand for a further term as a Councillor at the Local Elections in May 2006. The Chairman and Members wished him well for the future.
4. The Chairman advised that Cllr. Gerry Ceaser (Spelthorne BC) and Cllr. Ruth Cadbury (LB Hounslow) had been formally appointed to the Board of Directors for the Community Insulation Trust.

The main purpose and responsibility of the Board was to identify and prioritise where the £5 million that had been allocated for the insulation work should be spent, e.g. a school or hospice.

Therefore, rather than BAA deciding the order of works, the opportunity had been afforded for members of the community to come together and agree the best order of priority.

### **3005 ALPHA IN-FLIGHT KITCHEN FACILITIES**

A visit to observe the Alpha In-Flight Kitchen Facilities on the Bath Road, Heathrow, had taken place prior to the meeting. Alpha provided many of the meals for the airlines at the airport, together with a number of their Retail shops.

### **3006 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2006 were agreed.

### **3007 MATTERS ARISING**

1. The Chairman asked for feedback on matters arising from the meeting held on 25th January 2006.
2. John Gurney referred to Minute 2991 Item 6. He had made reference to a letter that had been printed in a January edition of 'Skyport' which had been sent in by an airport employee, relating to pollution. A request had been made for a report from BAA as to the policies that had been put in place by management to address this matter. He asked if this was available yet.

Ben Morton replied that this matter would be addressed and reported back to the Members at the May meeting.

## **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

### **3008 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT**

- (a) **Committee Membership** – Mrs. Lynette Braithwaite representing the **Air Transport Users' Council (AUC)** had been appointed to the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee with Mr. Philip Dann as Deputy.

- (b) **Independent Members of the Committee** – the time constraints under which these Members are appointed to the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee by BAA Heathrow were coming to an end. Advertisements were to be placed in the ‘Evening Standard’ inviting applications from frequent flyers to be appointed to the Committee.

Cllr. Bennett requested a copy of the advertisement to be sent to him, when it was placed in the Press. This was agreed.

- (c) **Heathrow Airport Support Group (HASG)** had now been wound up and its activities taken over by the **Future Heathrow Group**. BAA Heathrow had accepted the change and had invited the Group to appoint a representative to the HACC. This was Mr Frank Wingate who is the Chief Executive of West London Business.

- d) **The Chairman and Secretariat** had been notified by BAA Heathrow that it had been decided to re-model and update the Heathrow Visitor Centre, as a result of which it will be closed for some three months from June to September. During this time arrangements would have to be made for the use of alternative meeting and office facilities for the Committee. The Committee would be kept informed as this developed.

- (e) **Noise and Track Keeping Group** - Members had been concerned to know of changes which were expected in the working of this Group. A new Chair had been appointed to carry on the work of the Group. Her contact details are:  
Mrs Carrie Harris, Noise and Air Quality Manager, BAA Environmental Solutions,  
Heathrow Point West, 234 Bath Road, Hayes, Middx, UB3 5AP.  
Telephone 07786 680864 and e-mail [carrie\\_harris@baa.com](mailto:carrie_harris@baa.com)

The Chairman asked for volunteers from the main Committee Members who wished to be appointed to sit on this Group.

It was agreed that Cllr. Khursheed (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Ceaser (Spelthorne BC), Cllr. Beer (RB Windsor & Maidenhead) would continue as representatives.  
Cllr. Bill Lidgate (Bucks CC) would replace Cllr. Peter Roberts.

### **3009 COMMENTARY FROM THE DIVISIONAL DIRECTOR, BAA HEATHROW**

1. Discussion on matters reported by Mick Temple, Divisional Director, BAA Heathrow. BAA Statistical Information had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. **Potential Take-Over Bid from Spanish Construction Group, Grupo Ferrovial SA**  
Mick Temple said that as Members would have gathered, his ability to answer questions on this matter due to its confidential nature was very limited. However, the BAA Board had rejected the proposal. Grupo Ferrovial had been given a deadline of midday on 24th April 2006 to either announce a firm intention to make a bid for BAA or to walk away – commonly known as ‘put up or shut up’.

3. **Security**

Mr. Temple stated, as the Members had been made aware, particularly if they had flown from Heathrow recently that there had been some extensive queues at Security. This was as a consequence of several factors. Firstly, BAA were tested against the Regulatory Authorities. It had become clear that what passengers were bringing to the airport as hand baggage and what this contained had become increasingly difficult to assess in a very quick and simple way. Therefore, an increasing number of bags needed to be opened and disaggregated, in order to be clear that they did not contain a threat. The manifestation of that was the request to remove laptops from their case. This was not because there was a belief that there was a great threat from the laptop, but because the laptop could act as a screen in the X-Ray system for what surrounded it.

This had been enshrined in a Guideline, which was one step down from a Directive from the Department for Transport (DfT). This had required BAA and the airlines to be very much more restrictive regarding the size, specifically the thickness of the baggage, that people carried, when flying from the UK. It was the electronic gadgets that passengers carried in today's society that had caused BAA as an operator the problem, e.g. MP3 player, CD player, a mobile phone and charger and several other bits of electronic kit, packed in with their luggage in one bag. To identify what these were in today's significant environment from a security point of view, was problematic.

The changes required BAA to recruit a significant number of staff in order to keep the processing of passenger rates up. Since January 2006, when the new process was instigated, a further 62 people had been recruited. It was proposed to recruit another 150 people to get back to a normal, acceptable service. BAA had stated that security was the highest priority. Unfortunately, this exemplified the fact that whilst it was desirable to have both customer service and security, if there had to be a choice, it would be security.

4. **Terminal 5**

The construction of Terminal 5 was now three-quarters complete. The Control Tower had been handed over to NATS. The Control Tower was a trigger in the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) Regulations. This was another milestone achieved in BAA's regulatory obligations fulfilled. It was a splendid facility and the view from the top on a fine day was a 'sight to behold.'. More aircraft stands had been handed over from Terminal 5. They were now in use by the airport. The Piccadilly Line extension to Terminal 5 had been completed.. 13½ km of tunnels were now finished, apart from the fitting out, after which it would be ready for use.

5. **Mixed Mode**

There were changes in the consultation proposed by the Department for Transport on mixed mode. A methodology and technical report was due to be shortly published on the subject of how the air quality should be assessed.

6. **Terminal 2**

Notably, BAA had announced the intent to close Terminal 2. It had been indicated that should Heathrow East be approved, this would be constructed as quickly as possible after the opening of Terminal 5. The announcement signified that even if Heathrow East was not approved, Terminal 2 would still close, albeit 12-18 months later in 2009. To simplify, once all the airlines had moved around to where they wished to be, there was only 1.5 million passengers remaining to use Terminal 2. This was not sufficient to sustain a sensible Terminal operation, not only from a cost point of view, but also from a service point of view. BAA might manage to persuade 'W.H. Smith' and 'Boots' to remain in Terminal 2, but would not be able to persuade other retail outlets. It would not be viable for them to warrant this for that level of coverage. This had been out to consultation with the airlines. BAA were conducting this matter on the basis of the response to that.

7. **A380**

Mr. Temple said that BAA were still seeking confirmation from Airbus as to the actual date when the magnificent aircraft would arrive at Heathrow. It would be sometime before Summer 2006. HACC Members would be advised of the firm date, when known. (**Secretary's Note**): The A380 will arrive at 12 noon on 18th May 2006.

8. **Midnight Run**

Mr. Temple stated that a 10 km race up and down the Northern Runway had taken place at Midnight on Saturday 25th March 2006, in which he had participated.. There were 125 runners who took part. The security arrangements that were put in place to make this event possible were quite difficult. However, the Run raised over £30,000 for the Anthony Nolan Trust, which made this worthwhile. Thanks were extended to the Airside staff who arranged the security.

9. **60th Anniversary**

2006 was the 60th Anniversary date of Heathrow operating as a commercial airport. There were a number of celebrations planned. The Rotary Club would be co-ordinating their usual 'Family Day', around which there would be other events planned.

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

1. Philip Carlisle (Chairman of PSSC) referred to the subject of security. He had observed that BAA had lost approximately £400k in Service Quality Rebates (SQR) for the month of February 2006 in relation to security queues. It was accepted that security was more important than customer service, if a choice had to be made. However, the Passenger Services Sub-Committee had been inundated with letters of complaint in relation to security queues.

Philip Carlisle praised the response letters that had been sent out to the complainants from Marilyn Fitzgerald, Traveller Communications Facilitator, Service Solutions. He said that for the first time in his 5-6 years of Chairmanship to the PSSC, the letters that were being sent from BAA in answer to the complaints, were a model of well balanced and sensible advice or solution. If the letters continued in this vein, some of the problems that BAA had experienced would not come back again.

The Passenger Services Sub-Committee had made two observations in terms of passengers. Firstly, the question was asked why it was a factor that they were frustrated

in seeing channels unmanned. Secondly, when the new requirements came into force in January 2006, Mr. Carlisle said he personally experienced in Terminal 2, a managerial level member of BAA staff who was at the front of the queue, who had told him to remove his belt and take his laptop out of its case. However, when he recently travelled through Terminal 4, the same ruling did not apply.

The ruling on the belt was not applicable for staff inspections either. A Notice had been observed in Terminal 2 that belts should be removed. It was accepted that everyone suffered from the behaviour of their fellow passengers, many of whom could not or did not wish to read a Notice and would only react to being told to remove their belt and take their laptop out to the casing. It was suggested that this was done earlier on in the queue, rather than later.

It was understood from Janet McDonald, BAA Retail Operations Services Manager who had attended the PSSC meeting on the morning of 29th March 2006, that passengers should be informed of 'what to do' in advance by staff in yellow jackets who should be sweeping those queues.

Philip Carlisle advised that this was not happening consistently. It was thought that this practice had to be a help in solving the problem currently experienced by BAA, on the length of security queues.

It should also be noted that the PSSC had received complaints that the attitude of the security staff had not been the best. This could be attributable to the nature of the job. It was accepted that sometimes a passenger would receive a response according to the way in which they approached the other person.

However, it was intriguing to note that one complainant had witnessed people at the back of the queue being advised by BAA staff to start a new open queue and who had decided to jump under the Connections and then he was put through a full search. This did not make him very happy as a regular passenger.

Philip Carlisle addressed the subject of representation by BAA at the PSSC meetings. Janet McDonald was present, as usual, to give a Retail update. Toni Ball, Head of CSD Communications Shared Services had sent Apologies in advance of the meeting as she was on Annual Leave. However, Mazhar Butt, Travel Operations Manager, Commercial Transport Team was due to give an update on Taxis, but did not attend the meeting, nor did he send Apologies.

Lack of attendance at the meetings did make it difficult for the Members to make points, without appropriate representation by BAA.

Philip Carlisle referred to the proposed closure of the Visitor Centre. It could be seen from the amount of paperwork received by the Members that was developed by the Committee Secretary for both the PSSC and HACC, in addition to other Committees she serviced, this was of volume, and had to be stored somewhere

It would be hoped that in the BAA planning process for a new office for the Secretary, that sufficient space be allocated of a fixed position, in order that she could continue in

her role as she does now, to look after the Members and Committees in the coming months.

Mick Temple responded that in terms of BAA representation at the PSSC meetings, the comment made had been noted. BAA would ensure in future, that they had a more disciplined means of attendance. It was requested by Mr. Temple that he should be informed of who was due to attend, or more importantly, who was not attending and the reason why.

With regards to the security process, it was acknowledged that BAA did not have enough staff to man the scanning machines. He was clearly aware of the sensitivities that people had when they had queued for a long time and they passed through the security check-in and could observe there were machines which were unmanned and idle.

Mr. Temple stated that the simple reality was the fact that BAA did not have the resource nor did they plan to have the resource to man all of the machines all of the time. If the resource was available to man all of the machines constantly, there would be the other question addressed of him, in the fact that was he behaving like a monopolist and incurring excess costs in order to provide an efficient service. There was a balance that needed to be struck. Clearly when the rules changed, and this could happen very quickly, it would be a question how early BAA could respond.

BAA were able to respond relatively quickly to begin with, but now certain factors had come into play. The 'Working Time Directive' put more restriction on his ability to get staff to come in to work overtime. This reason was not offered as a criticism of the Directive, but a reality of the world we lived in and therefore the flexibility of BAA to respond quickly, with a limited amount of resource.

The turnover of staff on Security was relatively low and had always been so. This had not changed as a consequence of this new process, to date. Although as time progressed, staff were under pressure for a period of time and therefore this had an impact on their willingness to want to work overtime BAA did not have any other issues behind this.

A significant change in security requirement had occurred. To illustrate, this had reduced the efficiency of a group of people on one X-Ray machine when it was opened. Previously, BAA were able to process approximately 250-260 passengers per hour. When the change was implemented in January 2006, this number dipped to 200 passengers per hour, in some cases slightly less. This was equivalent to a 25% reduction in capacity and was not something that any company held in reserve.

With overtime and changes in process, most of the staff in the BAA offices had worked a considerable amount of hours, actually loading bags and whatever they could do to assist. The Unions had been very flexible about how BA A resourced people to conduct the queue-combing, whilst recognising that they were seeking to be prudent on staffing levels, where possible.

It took approximately three months from deciding that a security person was required to getting them screened, tested, trained and in post on the job. This process was currently underway to recruit further staff.

Mr. Temple said he probably received directly as many e-mails of complaint as the PSSC. His name was well-known as it appeared on the feedback cards. The response that he gave to complainants, was part of the model used by Marilyn Fitzgerald. BAA sought to be honest and straight-forward with the replies. There was nothing to hide on the process issue. It was nonetheless, a very unacceptable position and not what was desired for the airport as a whole. However, the majority of passengers were understanding. There were the few occasional sense of humour failures, on both sides. This was not to be applauded, but it was recognised, that it did occur. To some extent, it was understood why it happened, but Mr. Temple said he did not allow his staff to believe that it was acceptable.

2. Philip Carlisle pointed out that when he referred to all the scanning machines being fully manned, he was not inferring this should be the case, all the time. There was a perception that at peak times, they were still not being adequately manned, due to a lack of resource, at that particular time.

Mick Temple responded that it was recognised that BAA had tried to address this. However, the other aspect to this was the fact that BAA needed to ensure that staff received breaks. If staff were not given adequate breaks, their willingness to return to the job the following day, or work overtime for a few more hours would diminish very quickly. A balance had to be achieved.

3. Richard Barnes referred to the subject of security, both Airside and Landside. He asked Mr. Temple if he was content that the Landside security was at the right manning level, that it should be.

Mr. Temple responded that yes, he was satisfied with the level of operational security levels. BAA always sought to understand and hold dialogue with the local Superintendent about Police matters. From this, the operational decisions were made. BAA did not profess to be experts on the discussion of the Police operational aspects. Discussions were held occasionally on the charges made to BAA, as a consequence, but this was a separate issue.

4. Andy Hull reported that the Members who had attended the visit to the Alpha Flight Kitchen facilities had been informed that their vehicles were regularly delayed (up to half-an-hour) at the security check posts, in common with everyone else who supplied Airside goods. He asked if BAA were taking away resources from these posts (which did not involve the screening of laptops or electronic gadgetry) to man the passenger service areas.

Mr. Temple replied that changes had been made to the details of the process at security posts which had resulted in delays. Resources had been moved on occasions from Airside posts to the passenger areas, in order to balance this out. A large amount of time had to be spent in dialogue with the airlines, as getting a passenger through security to an aircraft that was delayed was a counter-productive activity. The whole concept had to be right.

Whilst it was agreed that resources had been relocated on occasions, this was not done systematically. It could be understood that Alpha Catering, together with others, would have experienced delays. When driving along the side of the airport, early in the morning, occasionally, vehicles could be seen returning from the security control posts. This was a necessary part in ensuring that the correct security was in place.

5. John Gurney believed that BAA could have put temporary measures in place to speed up the security process. Roller mats or tables could have been brought in for passengers to place their baggage on, to move along more quickly and assist the process.

In Terminal 4, he had witnessed people were still holding their coats and luggage, before they arrived at the Search area. They then had to wait and the next person could not move along. The whole process did not move very well.

Mr. Temple replied that he cautioned everyone, including himself, on the diagnosis of the problem in relation to security queues. He had a number of experts in 'sixth sigma manufacturing'. They had been studying the processes in some detail.

It was correct that there were issues that BAA needed to address, but this was a complex interactive process and as had been commented upon earlier, there was an element as to what people were prepared to be told what to do and how extensive BAA were prepared to do so. Whilst everyone could offer observations, Mr. Temple said he would take some persuading that BAA did not know what they were doing.

6. John Gurney referred to the South side of the airport. Part of this regularly became gridlocked. BAA had promised that there would be either Police or HAL traffic staff at the roundabout to ensure that this did not occur. Quite regularly, this became blocked up with traffic. Not once had a Police Officer or member of HAL traffic staff been seen monitoring the situation to ensure that vehicles did not block the roundabout.

Mr. Temple said he would take this action away. It was correct to say that HAL had agreed this matter would be addressed. However, if this had not occurred, this must be remedied.

7. Iain Hope referred firstly to the subject of security. He said that he had recently travelled on 'Eurostar'. The queue combing system at Waterloo, which was very congested, was very helpful. It was welcoming to learn that BAA were undertaking work on the subject of security queue-combing. The more that dialogue could be undertaken with passengers, in order to prepare them in advance before they reached the check-in point, the better the flow of process would be.

With regard to the Reading Air Link by bus, the London Chamber of Commerce (LCCI) had received a strong complaint in relation to the useful service from Reading station to Terminals 1, 2 & 3. Whilst the passengers were being dropped off as they requested, at the respective Terminal, at the same time, passengers who were returning from overseas flights who wished to travel to Reading Station were allowed to check onto the bus straight away and issued with a ticket and carry on their journey.

However, in January 2006 there was a change in the system with regard to outgoing passengers. They were now required to drag their baggage, (particularly tiresome from transatlantic flights), through the underground tunnels to the Central Bus Station. They then had to queue and wait to obtain tickets.

At the weekend, a queue could take as long as twenty minutes, before a passenger would reach the front, in order to purchase a ticket.

The complainants had asked why should they support public transport?

In the past, a door-to-door service was received. Now, after embarking from a flight, a passenger had to endure dragging suitcases around the airport and the inconvenience of queuing for a ticket. It would be suggested that it was easier to hire a cab into the airport.

Mr. Temple responded that he believed that this practice only applied to the forecourt of Terminal 3. The reasoning for this was the fact that BAA needed to undertake modifications to the forecourt of Terminal 3, in order that the old car park could be demolished and allow the forecourt to be opened up and provide a facility which would allow such a pick-up to take place.

There was a service entitled 'Park Lanes', the American Airlines premium drop-off. This needed to be moved to the front of the Terminal. However, it was too close to the car park to be able to demolish and yet still use the service. Virgin Atlantic also had facilities which needed to be relocated. To summarise, if buses stayed on the forecourt of Terminal 3 long enough to pick up passengers, currently, the view of BAA was that it would cause forecourt congestion to a degree that could gridlock the airport.

This was a short-plan period activity which was necessary. It was agreed that it was counter-productive in the short-term sense. The sentiments of the complainants could be fully understood as it did not encourage passengers to use public transport.

Mr. Temple suggested that the individual should be urged to log a complaint with BAA who would respond to this. Obviously, if BAA did not advise the complainant of the reason it would always be presumed that this was normal practice.

Iain Hope thanked Mr. Temple for his response and would advise the complainant to write to BAA. A request was made that the reasoning behind the forecourt works should be more widely publicised by BAA.

8. Cllr. Majumdar said firstly, that it was interesting to hear that the Control Tower had been handed over to NATS. The question was asked if it was possible for BAA to arrange a tour for HACC Members to take place prior to the July meeting.

Secondly, reference was made to the February 2006 Traffic Statistics report which had been circulated with the Agenda. In previous reports, details had always been received of the percentage of easterly and westerly workings and the number of Go-Arounds. This information had proved useful and it was proposed that these should be restored within the next report.

Thirdly, the question was asked if BAA and other colleagues could think about 'staffing' security check-points, rather than 'manning' them.

Mr. Temple responded in reverse order, that the third comment made was a valid point and acknowledged. A good percentage of staff were of both genders.

The second point relating to the Traffic Statistics would be addressed for future reporting by BAA.

Ben Morton added that he was under the impression that a full Traffic Statistics report had been circulated to the Members, If this was not the case, he would ensure the Secretary received the required information for distribution.

The first point requesting a visit to the Control Tower would be difficult, as it was located Airside. Getting there without an Airside Pass was a considerable activity which would take up a vast amount of hours. That said, the decision would not be at the discretion of BAA, but NATS. Therefore, a request would be made to NATS to consider this, on behalf of the Committee. However, it should be noted that if the visit was undertaken, it would be for a relatively small number of Members and would be quite a time consuming activity.

9. Cllr. Jacks referred to the abortive Bid from Grupo Ferrovía SA. He commented that the British economy was increasingly polarised, of which there was no doubt. However, he was concerned about private equity Bids and high leverage Bids. Ultimately, they had a habit of destroying assets.

As shareholder, Cllr. Jacks had written to the BAA Chairman, Marcus Agius. A courteous reply had been received. In his letter to the Chairman, he had stated that he found the potential Bid, not only as shareholder, but as a local citizen, unsatisfactory, which he believed he was entitled to state.

Cllr. Jacks asked the Committee Members if they had views on the matter of a company borrowing that amount of money or buying an organisation such as BAA.

Mick Temple responded “No Comment”.

10. The Chairman asked if the Members wished to convey any views on the subject. He did not believe the Committee would like to see a takeover Bid occur and asked if any Member was against this.

Paul Ellis said he had to take a neutral position on this.

Roger Wiltshire agreed it would not be possible to comment on this matter.

Iain Hope said that on behalf of the London Chamber of Commerce he had to be careful in a response on this issue. It should be remembered that the responsibilities of the Board of Directors were to their shareholders who owned the business. There were certain of the Members amongst the Committee who might support the Bid and others against. The Members had to be cautious about a very complex issue. He would not be very comfortable if there was too much comment from the Committee, at this stage.

11. Cllr. Jacks said that he was aware that there was a lot of criticism of Heathrow from the Members of the Committee on a variety of issues, but they should think about this matter carefully.
12. Cllr. Ceaser stated that from the point of view of a resident and a local authority, he would not like to see a Bid take place. It would be the worst of all worlds. The Board of Directors understood the needs of the company.

It was preferable to wait until a definite Bid was put in to BAA before commenting further.

13. Cllr. Dhillon stated how could a potential Bidder for BAA be prevented from doing so.
14. The Chairman stated that the comments had been noted. No further action would be taken by the Committee at the moment on this subject, as there were obviously mixed views.

### **3010 MIXED MODE OPERATIONS AT HEATHROW AIRPORT**

1. Government Statement Postponing Consultation.  
Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.450**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. David Gray referred to the Ministerial Statement made by Derek Twigg, the Under-Secretary of State for Transport on 17th March 2006, where it had been announced that the mixed mode consultation would be postponed.  
It did not signify the retraction of the Government's intentions, but was a realistic assessment of what was achievable in the time available.

There was a general public expectation that there would be a consultation in the Spring, but the Ministers had decided to defer this.

Work continued on the study. An update Paper had been circulated to the Members (see Minute 3012).

- .3. Cllr. Ceaser asked if there was any indication when the mixed mode consultation would be published.

David Gray said that the judgement on this was for Autumn 2006.

4. Peter Viggers asked if the mixed mode consultation would automatically include the Cranford Agreement and Westerly Preference or would they be the subject of separate consultations.

David Gray responded that the intention would be that the mixed mode consultation would also address and contain questions in relation to the Cranford Agreement and Easterly/Westerly Preference.

### **3011 AVIATION EXPANSION IN LONDON – THE MAYOR'S VIEWS**

1. Record of discussion with the Mayor at the London Assembly and.  
Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.448**) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. The Chairman stated that it was clear from the report that Mayor Livingstone was not in favour of expansion at Heathrow, from an environmental point of view.

The Chairman asked if Richard Barnes would like to comment on this subject, as a Member of the London Assembly.

Richard Barnes replied that he did not wish to speak on behalf of the Mayor of London. It was not a matter for the London Assembly.

3. Roger Wiltshire stated that he was interested in paragraph 6 of the report relating to certain rights of direction the Mayor had with the local authority over some strategic planning proposals at Heathrow. He would like to identify the source of the assessment in the Paper.

### **3012 PROJECT FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF HEATHROW (PSDH)**

#### **- HEATHROW SURFACE ACCESS STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

1. Minutes of Group meeting held on 1st February 2006;  
Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.449**) and Update report by the Department for Transport on the work of the Technical Groups had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Virginia Godfrey referred to the Minutes of the DfT Surface Access Stakeholder Group where it had been stated that a full Air quality Technical Report would be published in the 'next month or so', following Peer Review. The question was asked if a more definite timescale could be given on this.

David Gray responded that he hoped it would be in 'the not too distant future'. It had previously been anticipated that it would be before Easter. However, this looked to be increasingly unlikely, although it was again hoped that it would not be delayed too much further after that. However, if this was not the case, it was probable that it would swiftly follow the Local Elections.

3. Peter Viggers commented that as previously discussed, with the exception of the Technical Adviser, Maurice Hudson, it had been noted that the entire DfT Surface Access Stakeholder Group was made up mainly of DfT and airline members. There was no representation from environmental bodies. It was thought that the composition of the Group should be re-addressed.
4. Rob Gibson stated that there was also no representation on the DfT Surface Access Stakeholder Group from the local authorities.  
He said he had written to Roger Gardner at the DfT requesting an extension of time, to consider the draft of the Air Quality Technical Report, as there was so much to read.

David Gray responded to the above points. He understood that the Technical Report would run to approximately 300 pages and was still being written. He appreciated that there was a lot of material contained in this to digest.

The DfT had previously spoken to the Committee on engagement with local authorities on surface access. It was a subject on which the DfT were in dialogue with BAA. A commitment had been given by the DfT that there would be a process of engagement, once an initial result had been established.

5. Cllr. Ceaser referred to the Progress Note by the Department for Transport dated March 2006, section Surface Access – Rail. He had noted that the report commissioned by the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) to review the business case for AirTrack could now be accessed on the DfT website and that BAA had engaged Network Rail to carry out further detailed work on a number of issues, with a view to further discussions after Easter. It was further noted that the Bidders for the South West rail franchise are to be invited to include the costs of operating Airtrack services within that scenario.

Spelthorne BC as a local authority would probably be the most affected by the Airtrack proposal from the airport, with the Chord running through the Town Centre. This would cause considerable difficulty for Staines

An assurance was requested from David Gray that Spelthorne BC would be involved in these particular matters, rather than being told in due course, what the result would be.

David Gray replied that the project was very much at the feasibility stage where studies were being undertaken to look at the potential contribution of Airtrack, with a mix of options for Heathrow. The lead on the Airtrack scheme as such, within the Department for Transport, was under his Railway colleagues. He was not aware what contact they previously had with Spelthorne BC. However, he would take this point away to relay to them directly.

**3013 FLU PANDEMIC CONTINGENCY PLANNING AT HEATHROW AIRPORT**  
A presentation from John Norman, BAA Head of Business Continuity Planning.  
(*enclosed*).

1. Mr. Norman explained that his role was to co-ordinate business continuity management across BAA's airports. It was an activity that he had been engaged in for over a year, for a potential global Flu Pandemic.

An outline was given to the Members to give clarity on what a Pandemic would mean in the UK.

Firstly, a distinction between the normal seasonal Flu which occurred every Winter and Avian or 'Bird Flu' which had quite often been referred to in the Press and a potential Flu Pandemic.

Seasonal Flu, was by no means a small matter itself. It did normally lead to around 12,000 deaths per annum in the UK. This was associated with the complications of bronchitis or pneumonia, particularly in the elderly.

The outbreak of Avian Flu, as the name suggested was present in poultry and wildfowl. The outbreak had been predominately in Asia. As depicted in the Press coverage, some cases had been caused by migrated birds which had reached Western Europe and West Africa.

Generally, the Avian Flu was caused by those people who were in very close proximity to birds. In South-East Asia, a lot of people lived with poultry, literally in their house. Those at risk were particularly those people who slaughtered poultry for eating. To date, there had been 184 cases in South-East Asia, of which 103 cases had proved to be fatal.

Obviously, it could be a very serious problem for the UK's poultry farmers if Avian Flu got into British flocks, but not for the general population.

It was also worth noting that this virus had been in existence since 2003. It was not a new phenomenon. Flu Pandemics were natural. They had occurred three times in the last Century; 1918 (Spanish Flu), 1957 and 1959/1959. It should be made clear that no virus able to cause a Pandemic existed. It was only the virus that caused the Avian Flu which could be trans-commuted into a completely new virus.

As a consequence of it becoming a new virus, general modelling had shown, that up to 25% of the population could actually become ill. The Government modelling had also suggested that if the population did become ill, it could cause 50,000 excess deaths in the UK.

The key issue for all of those involved in planning for a Pandemic, is that whilst most of the scientists and experts predicted that a Pandemic would occur, it was not known when. It was suggested that the presence of Avian Flu increased the possibility.

Should a Pandemic occur, the first point that people would ask was the availability of vaccine. As this virus had not yet merged, it had not been possible to trial the development of vaccine. The development could take around six months, if it were fast-tracked through the various phases that new medicine had to go through.

The Government would provide anti-viral drugs (TAMIFLU). There were sufficient stocks of this drug to treat 25% of the population, should they catch the virus. The idea behind the drug would be to ease the symptoms and get people back on their feet earlier than if they were untreated.

The Government had bought up stocks of TAMIFLU. The Greater London Authority had a separate stockpile of TAMIFLU for the London Police, Fire and Ambulance Services and Transport for London workers.

The models that the Government had undertaken had shown that from the first case of a Flu Pandemic reaching a major urbanisation in South-East Asia to the disease first occurring in the UK, was likely to be around a month or even less. They had also predicted that even if all of the UK borders were closed and a 99.9% restriction placed on travel to the country, it could only be expected to delay the manifestation of the virus by around two months. Once it had reached the UK, it would be expected that it would spread across the country within 2-3 weeks. 25% of the population would be likely to be made ill by the virus, with a further 25% who could carry the virus without showing the symptoms. Potentially, it could be a very critical situation.

However, the matter was being very closely monitored by the World Health Organisation (WHO) who basically worked to a Sixth Stage Alert System, from 'no new virus in humans but current animal virus' down to 'human infection'. Alert Stage 3 had been reached on their programme. On reaching Alert Stage 4, a number of steps in the airport contingency plan would start to kick in to being.

To ensure that the airport was as ready as possible to cope with a Flu Pandemic, it was firstly, important to keep in close contact with local partners in the community. BAA had worked very closely with National Government during the past year, together with the Department of Health, Department for Transport and the Health Protection Agency. Contact had also been made with the LB Hillingdon and the Primary Care Trust (PCT).

The Government had now formed a Resilience Forum. With that, BAA had also worked on all sorts of measures that could be thought of. Work was also being undertaken on a communications plan for each stage of a Pandemic. The aim was to have this ready, such that, should the Alert be raised, BAA could start rolling this out.

A Pandemic was not a short-term affair. Normally it came in two waves. There could be up to six months between the two waves, each wave lasting three months.

Also, having begun discussions with the airport community, no airport organisation was going to be exempt from feeling the effects of a Flu Pandemic. Everyone needed to know each others' plans, to ensure that they were complimentary and no gaps were left in the process.

One of the key measures already underway was the changing of the cleaning regime at the airport. The virus could be spread by a person sneezing and another inhaling the virus from the atmosphere. However, the virus could also live outside of the human body. Therefore, particular attention should be made to places that people 'touched' at the airport e.g. hard surfaces, handrails, lift push buttons etc. By doing this, it could slow down the spread within the buildings.

Above all, BAA were keen to focus on the 'people' issue. Discussions had taken place between the Health and Safety representatives on the airport, the Planning Manager and the Group Medical Adviser to work through the meaning of a Pandemic and identify practical measures that could be put in place as a protective measure.

Thought had to be given to identify where absence of workers through a Pandemic would most affect the operation of the airport. Clearly, certain jobs would fall into this category, e.g. the Fire Service and security staff. Plans were currently being developed and modelled that would enable BAA to cope with a certain degree of absenteeism and pinpoint what it might be possible to do to make the operation function, as normally as it could.

Hygiene would be a critical issue for staff. Plans were underway to promote the use of alcohol hand-wipes regularly. Clearly, good personal hygiene would have some affect on the risk element. The use of face masks had been discussed with the Health & Safety representatives, but it had been determined that they offered little protection. Management arrangements had been debated and how these may need to be altered in the event of a Pandemic outbreak.

From the latest plan, firstly, it was clear that there may be a need to health screen inbound passengers to the UK. Secondly, the Government may require BAA to screen people leaving the UK to their home countries. A regime would need to be adopted that would allow the airport to function in as normal a manner as possible.

BAA were also undertaking a top level exercise with other partners through the local community.

2. Following on from this presentation, Members asked questions/responded.
3. The Chairman thanked Mr. Norman for the presentation and stated that it was encouraging to note the amount of preventative work that BAA had undertaken.
4. Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey asked if there was a certain criteria to identify that a Pandemic existed. At what point would BAA order the proceedings to commence. Would it be at Stage 6.

Mr. Norman referred to the six stages. He said it would not be at Stage 6, but before that. Due to the nature of the business at the airport, there were certain functions that BAA clearly needed to carry out before that stage was reached. A lot of work would be carried out when Pandemic Alert 4 was reached, if the remote possibility existed at that stage that an airport worker could become in contact with the virus. However, it may not be until Stage 5 or even Stage 6, that the likelihood was confirmed..

5. Cllr. Dhillon referred to the fact that BAA had spoken to the LB Hillingdon in relation to a Pandemic Flu outbreak occurring at the airport. However, nearly 70% of airport workers lived in the boroughs of Ealing, Hounslow, Southall and Hammersmith. What would happen in this instance.

Mr. Norman replied that it was a valid point that the surrounding areas were equally important. Due to the geographical location of the airport in relation to Hillingdon, discussions were initially held with that particular local authority. However, the other outlying areas suggested would also be contacted to discuss the process with them.

6. Richard Barnes asked that given the time element that the Avian Flu virus would take to germinate outside of the body, why did the health standards need to be improved upon at the airport to meet the criteria. Why were they not the standards now, given the nature of the amount of passengers that came through Heathrow.

Mr. Norman responded that there were various viruses present the whole time.

Effectively, focus was being put on practices to reduce the risk. However, this could not be sustained the whole time.

7. John Gurney reported that British Airways had met with the Trade Union Council within the company to discuss the Flu Pandemic contingency plan. Work was currently underway on this.

#### **3014 BAA NOISE SEMINAR 2006**

1. Report of proceedings by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.451**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman referred to the latest BAA Noise Booklet which had recently been published and distributed to each Member. He asked if there were any comments on the Paper.
3. Virginia Godfrey stated that having looked at the Booklet, it made her realise the excellence of the BAA Flight Evaluation Report, which was a better model. It had been written in an intelligent manner with respect for the local people.. The tone of the BAA Noise Booklet spoke down to the residents around the airport.

Ben Morton responded that this was not the intention at all. The BAA Noise Booklet was meant to be a qualitative, informative and constructive report.

#### **3015 CONSULTATION ON MAYOR OF LONDON'S RAIL POWERS OUTSIDE OF THE LONDON BOUNDARY**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.452**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman proposed that a special meeting of the Surface Access Sub-Committee, should be held on Friday 12th May 2006 to discuss this subject, in conjunction with the debate on the Mayor of London's Planning powers within the local authority. All Members of HACC would be invited to attend, if they so wished.

#### **3016 'HEATHROW DIPS IN AIRPORTS RANKING'**

1. Press article from the 'Daily Telegraph' dated 20th March 2006, as submitted by Cllr. Rodney Bennett, LB Richmond on Thames had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

#### **3017 FLIGHT OF EVERGREEN B747 OVER LONDON AND SOUTH-EAST ENGLAND**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.453**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman reported that a further communication had been sent to him. Action had been taken by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) in response to the report submitted on behalf of the Committee on the Evergreen B747 flight. It did not look to be a major change, but it did take on board the matter of congested areas to try to alleviate flights over them.

3. Iain Hope had suggested that an invitation should be extended to Sir Roy McNulty to attend a HACC meeting to explain his response letter in further detail and also to provide an update to the Committee on the attitude of the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) on these matters. Having read the response letter, Iain Hope said he was still somewhat puzzled on Point 6 and why the flight was not diverted to the military airfield at Fairford.

The Committee Members agreed to the suggestion that Sir. Roy McNulty should be invited to attend a future HACC meeting to discuss the matter further.

4. Cllr. Ceaser stated that the response letter from Sir Roy McNulty had not addressed the issue of concern expressed by the Committee. The response had quoted a revised policy which stated that the advice would be given to the Flight Commander to divert to another airfield, but if he did not wish to take this advice, he did not have to. Apart from changing the rules to be able to give the Captain some advice, he could still choose to ignore this and bring his damaged aircraft in, across the centre of London, with the risk that parts could fall off the body of the aircraft over a highly populated, dense part of the world.

It was not thought that the explanation for the incident that occurred was satisfactory. Direction should be taken by the Captain and not advice. However, how a policy was reached where the CAA actually went from *advising* the Captain that the aircraft should be diverted to an alternative airport to *telling* him that he had to travel to another airport had yet to be determined.

It was totally unacceptable that an aircraft had taken off from Germany, travelled almost as far as Bristol, and the Captain decided that as there was a problem and purely because he had seen Heathrow on his way down and knew the location, he wished to land there. The Committee should press the CAA to reach a conclusion where the Captain could be directed to an alternative airport, rather than risk coming in over London with the risk of dropping the aircraft over a highly populated area.

5. Philip Carlisle commented as an ex-professional air crew person with twenty years experience with BOAC. It was a fairly fundamental basis of aircraft operation that the Captain was the 'King'. If he had a problem, it was his responsibility. He said that once during his aviation career, he had instructed a pilot to abandon an aeroplane over East Anglia. It was only in hindsight that it was thought where would this hit. It could have been one person on the road on a bicycle or in the middle of a City. However, the decision as made was thought to be correct at the time, under the circumstances.

Philip Carlisle stated that the Evergreen B747 incident reminded him of the 'dangerous dog' legislation. Trying to change what seemed to be a fairly successful system for many decades on the basis of one albeit, confused and inappropriate advice would be bad for all. It was thought that in general terms, the CAA had gone as far as it possibly could. The decision with regard to landing a distressed aircraft should be left to the pilot who was managing the flight at the time.

6. Roger Wiltshire endorsed the statement made by Philip Carlisle. He asked that if a representative from the CAA should be invited to attend a future HACC meeting, that they were asked to comment on the general rules. For correctness, it should be noted that the Captain could be either a male or female.
7. Cllr. Knight stated that he was also perplexed on Point 6 of the response letter from Sir Roy McNulty. Reading through the finer details from the AAIB Report, it looked that the consideration of the cargo on board the aircraft was a long way down the line. The Evergreen B747 would only carry military charts e.g, Mildenhall. It was thought that the aircraft should have been diverted to Mildenhall. The reason that Heathrow was selected was due to the fact that it was a clear day and could be spotted easily. However, the aircraft should not have flown over London with the risk involved. Stansted which was more rural would have been a better, safer option at which to land the aircraft. This point should be further pursued by the Committee.
8. Philip Carlisle pointed out that if Mildenhall had been chosen, this would still take the aircraft over London. The question would be asked at what stage would the aircraft 'fall out of the sky'. From reading the AAIB report, it was realised that there had been a problem. However, it was not desirable to change the whole system and state dogmatically that a pilot would be instructed to carry out a procedure, albeit in a more constructive manner.
9. Peter Viggers stated that given the technology of today, was it not possible to have some means that the Air Traffic Controllers could advise the pilot to which airport they should divert to, with instructions on how to get there.
10. The Chairman agreed that there had been sufficient concern shown by the Committee Members to warrant a representative from the CAA to be present at the May HACC meeting to answer questions on this debate.
11. Philip Carlisle advised that the European Union (EU) had recently published a list of flights and carriers who would not be allowed to operate into and out of EU airspace.

### **3018 AIR POLLUTION AT HEATHROW**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.454**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted..
2. The Chairman stated that as confirmed by David Gray, the DfT would be publishing a report on Air Quality within the next month or so. Information from HACAN/Clearskies and the Airfields Environment Federation (AEF) had been tabled, together with data from the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and the response from BAA.

### **3019 CAA DECISION ON REVISED STANDARDS AND REBATES AT HEATHROW AND GATWICK AIRPORTS**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.455**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. Further information was available upon request.

### **3020 GENERAL PURPOSES SUB-COMMITTEE**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Sub-Committee held on 3rd March 2006 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. John Gurney pointed out that he had been omitted from the list of Attendees at the meeting. This was acknowledged.
3. Paul Ellis requested that the following amendments be made to the minutes.

Minute 2.8, paragraph 1 should read '*passengers travelled from East of the West End*'.

Minute 2.8, paragraph 4 should read '*BAA had spent three quarters of a billion pounds over the last 10-12 years on rail investment at Heathrow*'.

Minute 3.0, sub-section 1.5 should read '*the final CAA Constructive Engagement document would be published in June 2006 between the Heathrow airlines and BAA*'.

Minute 3.0, sub-section 1.12 should read '*but with a condition attached to it, to allow for the Retail Price Index plus 6.5%, which had been added, to take account of the costs of Terminal 5*'.

### **3021 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2006 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Cllr. Khursheed queried the fact that he had observed no representation from London Underground had been apparent at the last two meetings. He asked if there was a particular reason for this.

Philip Carlisle responded that the attendance of London Underground at the PSSC meetings was requested periodically and was not required at every meeting. He asked if there was a specific point that was of interest to be raised with LUL.

In response, Cllr. Khursheed referred to Minute 5.16 where the Chairman had suggested that it might be feasible, if BAA could reach an agreement with London Underground (LUL) for free passage out of the central station as far as Hatton Cross.

Cllr. Khursheed believed that if this could be agreed, it would be very useful, as passengers were currently charged nearly £3.00 to travel on the Underground from the Central Terminal Area to Hatton Cross.

Philip Carlisle explained that this suggestion had been made only in relation to the problem on local taxi journeys. As the local taxi drivers would trade from Hatton Cross, he had suggested that ideally, if it was free, for that one stop, it would get passengers out of Heathrow and to Hatton Cross to continue their onward journey. From where it was priced as a local taxi service, rather than paying £30, £40, or £50 for a taxi out of the Central Area.

3. Mike Forster commented that BAA were looking at Connectivity around the airport from 2008 onwards, as the shape of the airport changed and how the bus services might be reviewed around the airport. When Terminal 5 opened, the free travel within the perimeter would continue. Passengers would be able to travel within certain terminal areas, free on the Heathrow Express (HEX) and Heathrow Connect systems.

BAA had asked London Underground to consider what they might do in relation to Connectivity within the environment of the airport, including Hatton Cross. London Underground did not make any comment at the time, as this was still under review.

4. Philip Carlisle said he understood that the 285 bus service was no longer easily accessible to workers in the main hangar areas because of the closure of the Eastchurch Crossing. There was now a 5-minute walk involved to reach an access point for the service. Compared to the service that the workers previously had, which was either a short cross-over to pick up the bus or the bus travelled nearer to the hangars than they now do to pick up staff, this had caused an inconvenience.

The question was asked if either BAA/British Airways or any of the other airlines who operated those hangars could put pressure on London Transport to review the service for the airport workers. The service could be allowed to run from Hatton Cross and back again to one roundabout, travel around that and pick up most of the people who wished to use that service. Again, this would be in an effort to maximise the use of public transport and not encourage workers to use private cars.

5. John Gurney added that the net result of this problem was also the fact that there were staff who cycled in to work, but had abandoned this because they had now a big trek around the airport on Eastchurch Road. Likewise, people who were coming out of the BA hangars, Virgin, British Midland and all the other facilities that were in that vicinity, were now cut off from public transport.

Mike Forster said he would take these comments away to ask the BAA public transport planning team what a sensible solution might be to resolve this problem.

### **3022 NTK WORKING GROUP**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

### **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

#### **3023 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT**

1. LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for October to December 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. John Gurney queried the fact despite a previous request to remove the category for Concorde from the report, this still had not been actioned. *'Complaints about fixed wing aircraft and Concorde'*.

Nita Easey responded that as BAA had reported on Concorde, it had been left on the report intentionally, for historical reasons. If the way in which Concorde was recorded was changed, it would cause interference to the records of the complaints that were previously received in relation to this aircraft.

In the past, people were recording complaints relating to Concorde that were not occurring as it had been de-commissioned in 2003. However, BAA had a commitment to record and report on that which was told to them, not what actually happened. It is for these reasons that Concorde remained on the report.

**3024 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for January and February 2006 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

**3025 NEWS RELEASES AND PRESS CUTTINGS**

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

**3026 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Cllr. Maddan referred to a report he had read in the Press on 16th March 2006, whereby the Court had cleared the way for turning Berlin airport into a major hub by 2011. The Court had had over-ruled the residents' objections and had given the green light for the two-billion-euro (2.4-billion-dollar) project (*enclosed*).

The decision by the country's highest administrative Court would result in Schoenefeld airport becoming the third biggest air hub in the country, as Berlin Brandenburg International Airport, capable of handling 22 million passengers a year.

The airport could be built according to plan, but with extensive improvements to the noise reduction and a ban on night flights between midnight and 5.00 a.m.

2. Virginia Godfrey asked David Gray if he could advise the Committee when the new night noise regime proposals would be put forward.

David Gray responded 'shortly'.

3. John Gurney referred to the BAA Press Release which had been circulated on the closure of the Eastchurch Road Crossing. It had made reference to the fact that it had been operational for the past 18 years. To his knowledge, this was incorrect as it had been operational for 35 years. This was acknowledged.
4. There were no further items to discuss and the Chairman closed the meeting.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

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





