

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Business Meeting held on 6th December 2006 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Mohammed Khurshed	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. John Oswell (Deputy)	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Ruth Cadbury	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Christopher Turrell	-	Bracknell BC
Cllr. Martin Elengorn	-	LB Richmond upon Thames
Cllr. Ian Potts	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. Patrick Roberts	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Julia Long	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos	-	Surrey CC
Cllr. Gerry Ceaser	-	Spelthorne BC
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Lynette Braithwaite	-	AUC
John Gurney	-	TUC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Mako Mochizuki	-	Independent
Susan Laurie	-	Independent
Colin Mitchell	-	Independent
Mike Walsh	-	Independent

OTHERS:

David Gray	-	Department for Transport
Martyn Jeffrey	-	NATS

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Stephen Nelson	-	BAA CEO
Tony Douglas	-	Chief Executive Officer
Mike Forster	-	Business Strategy Director
Ben Morton	-	Director of Communications

APOLOGIES:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

Cllr. David Bishop (LB Hillingdon), Brian Yates (Consumers' Association), Philip Carlisle (GTMC), Roger Wiltshire (BATA), Frank Wingate (Future Heathrow), Geoff Pope (London Assembly), Cllr. Barbara Harris (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Bill Lidgate (Bucks CC), Cllr. Dev Dhillon (South Bucks DC).

3079 Stephen Nelson, Chief Executive of BAA Limited addressed the Committee.

- 1.. The Chairman said that he was very pleased to welcome Stephen Nelson, the recently appointed Chief Executive of BAA Limited. Mike Clasper, former BAA plc. Chief Executive had previously attended the HACC Seminar for each year of his reign. It was thought that Stephen Nelson had a 'baptism of fire' into the company with the change of ownership and unprecedented security measures that he had been faced with. It was with interest that the Members would listen to the informal comments that would be made in the address to the Committee.
2. Stephen Nelson thanked the Chairman for his welcome. He said that it was a pleasure to attend the meeting. He made a series of relatively informal comments, which he thought it was important to establish in the conversation with the Members. There were an enormous amount of matters going on in the aviation world and at Heathrow.

Stephen stressed the importance of Heathrow and how the future was viewed and he indicated some of the threats, which it was necessary to be mindful of going forward, e.g. on the environmental debate on climate change, which it was thought was the radical social issue of the time. Security Information on Ferrovial, the new owners of BAA would also be shared.

Stephen agreed that his appointment was a 'baptism of fire' but behind this there were positive facts.

Stephen Nelson gave a perspective around Heathrow. It was thought that it was extraordinarily important for us to recognise that Heathrow was a huge employer. Heathrow Airport employed 70,000 people directly and a further 100,000 indirectly, associated with it.

He said he had attended a Press Conference earlier in the week with CBI and Willie Walsh (Chief Executive of British Airways) explaining the importance of aviation. The whole aviation industry employed 186,000 people directly. Therefore, Heathrow had a large proportion of these staff and a hugely important position in the employment of men and women associated with aviation.

An interesting statistic to note was this figure was just slightly less than the whole of the British Steel and Coal Industries in the 1980's, before that industry arguably collapsed.

Stephen Nelson stated that the pre-eminence of Heathrow was taken for granted, but he did not think people should. Heathrow was now fourth, if not fifth, down the table for the number of destinations served in Europe. Munich had just gone ahead of Heathrow.

He said that it was interesting to both him and his colleagues, that in terms of regional air services to cities in Britain; Heathrow served 9, Amsterdam served 21, Paris served 19. What could be seen here often was a very important concept of globalisation and competition. Frankfurt and the German Government some time ago understood the importance of a rather cumbersome jargon of inter-modal network, which basically meant linking air with train travel.

Until recently, Frankfurt had approximately 150 Inter-City services of high speed trains per day, serving it. The high-speed link was started in May 1999.

A further point to emphasise the competition which Heathrow faces and which Stephen said he had spent a considerable time discussing with Tony Douglas, BAA Heathrow CEO, was in relation to Dubai, which because it is a long distance away, may not be considered worth worrying about by some. Dubai was planning, in line with its booming economy, to open up a second airport with an approximate 140 million passenger capacity per annum. At the moment, their airport capacity is 70-80 million passengers per annum; this development would put them in the region of 210-220 million passengers total capacity per annum.

Heathrow was working extremely hard to handle even a capacity of 68-70 million passengers. It was important to realise people travelling from the Pacific Rim and the Far East or Australia would be able to travel on larger aircraft such as the A380 to Dubai and hop over to the United States. From the logic as outlined, it was extraordinarily important to the UK's national economy, that the position of growth of Heathrow must not be taken for granted.

BAA were proud that they had a truly galvanising vision for Heathrow over the next decade.

Stephen said that he was delighted that the Members would be taking in Terminal 5 as part of their tour. The project would continue to be led by Tony Douglas. It was an outstanding monument to leadership and was a different way of managing construction which was on time and budget.

Stephen Nelson referred to Airtrack. He reported that BAA would lead with a proposal for legislation for Airtrack, which would confirm that it was a good transport system for passengers for the South-West. It would cover a catchment area of Reading, around Guildford and linking in with Waterloo. BAA believed that at relatively low cost and with low new-build of rail track itself, up to 3.2 million passengers could be travelling into Heathrow by 2015. The timescales were also slightly challenging in airport development, but 2015 was a feasible date.

BAA had backed and would continue to back, the White Paper. Stephen said that it was on record that both he and Tony Douglas believed that the White Paper was the right thing for the nation and that there was absolutely no case for a U-turn on this. The White Paper specified that the country, and indeed the London system, required significant expansion of runway capacity because it was already full. The impact of this could be seen on the passengers by the pressure on capacity.

The target date was 2012 for Stansted and potentially a new runway at Heathrow not before 2015, provided air quality and noise measures could be met.

Stephen said he would be leading this. BAA were twin-tracking both of these proposals and would be representing a very strong case to Government. It was believed that the Update on the White Paper which the Government would publish on 14th December 2006, would reinforce that this was the right thing for the nation.

Stephen Nelson stated that finally, to balance the picture, the development to the West of the City, in his view depended strategically upon what BAA could deliver in this extraordinarily important part, called Heathrow.

BAA had new terminal capacity and runway possibilities, notwithstanding the very important impact upon the communities. If the East of London was viewed, the development of the Thames Gateway, North up to Cambridge was receiving a lot of the money and attention. There was an interesting strategic debate to drive the capacity position at Heathrow.

Environment and climate change affected us all as individuals, as well as the nation and ultimately, internationally. In perspective, a balance needed to be struck. The UK aviation services, including international flights, accounted for 6% of the UK's total carbon emissions. The UK accounted for 2% of global emissions. Mathematically, the UK based aviation services accounted for 0.1% of global carbon dioxide emissions. People could be forgiven for thinking it was a very different number. However, it was expected that there would continue to be a demand for air travel, which is why BAA proposed to build new capacity; the number share would grow.

Stephen said that his message on this matter was that there was no room for complacency, but there was room for balance. This was the message that both he and Willie Walsh (CEO of BA) had put on the table earlier in the week. Aviation delivered approximately £11 billion to the economy, according to an Oxford Economic Forecasting Study update. The White Paper proposals which included mixed-mode and a third runway and indeed Stansted, by 2030, would in themselves deliver £13 billion additional growth to the economy. If the full cost of meeting the environmental impacts was set against this, a range of £1 billion-£2 billion could be achieved.

It was for this reason, that the development of aviation, particularly at Heathrow, was extraordinarily important. The benefit to the economy was very considerable, according to the best study that BAA had been able to review; the costs were manageable.

BAA were closely backing emissions trading. This subject needed explanation, as it was slightly complicated. However, Stephen said that he did not think that emissions trading would be here 'tomorrow'. BAA was a very significant employer, and was a major contributor to the national economy. The capacity was needed, but the environmental change was a real issue.

It was interesting to note that the proposed Boeing 787 had a fuel efficiency such, that to transport one passenger for 100 miles, it used only 2.3 litres of fuel. That fuel efficiency was better than any train. However, what people tended to do was divorce the two; a train was a public transport system and flying was mainly for holidays, business and leisure. An appropriate balance needed to be struck.

A final point on the environmental, global issue. The fact that aviation represented 0.1% of total emissions in terms of UK aviation, means that local solutions were needed. It would not be easy, but BAA would play its role in that, both in Europe and for when it went more global.

Mr. Nelson acknowledged that it had been placed on record that in relation to Security, this was not BAA's finest hour. The fact was that anybody who had travelled through a BAA airport or any other airport in the UK during the security crisis would have experienced huge and very frustrating disruption, for which an apology was given.

At the same time, it was the most onerous security regime ever imposed on airports. It would have required Tony Douglas and his team to have had somewhere in the region of 500-600 or possibly more, stand-in Security Guards available to meet the demand as the regime levels tripled.

As witnessed in the terminals, BAA were painfully aware and conscious of the security queues. BAA was working aggressively towards the recruitment of additional staff to address this. However, this would not come soon enough to solve the problem, but it was improving.

It should also be remembered that there was a very material threat to the security and safety of passengers from people who would commit mass murder. BAA responded as best they could to the instructions driven by the Government. If anybody thought it had been a little exercise e.g. conspiracy theories which stated that there wasn't really a threat, this was absolutely wrong.

The information from MI5 and MI6 very clearly suggested that there was a real threat. To a degree, this still remained, as Heathrow was a serious target.

Airports had reacted to this as best they could, until they received improved technology, and the right number of Security personnel had been appointed. Tony Douglas and his team had been very proactive in arranging the installation of 12 new screening machines.

Stephen Nelson spoke on Ferrovial. From speculation and the Press, the Members would have seen all kinds of matters occurring. They may have seen customers at other airports, speculating idly about the management under Ferrovial. A sensible observer would understand the situation.

Ferrovial and the two other shareholders were long-term investors. They were not in the business for a five-year gain. They wanted to build and manage the best airports with their local management teams, to the best of their ability.

They were ready to invest, although it was acknowledged that they had a lot of debt. There was the ability to invest behind Heathrow, of which there was no doubt, provided that the Regulatory Authority gave the right incentives. This was one of the debates that the management were dealing with. There was a long way to go on this matter.

The Members were advised not to over-react or believe all the Press articles published. It was a long systematic process. There was much time for consultation and getting things right.

With Ferrovial, BAA had a long-term owner of Heathrow, together with a management team that Stephen Nelson said he was proud to be associated with.

There was a vision which could be expanded upon to 2012 and beyond. There was an absolute necessity to safeguard this most important, international hub.

Finally, BAA had a very important role to play, listening and responding to the local communities. It was for this reason that there was participation in Consultative Committees. Stephen said that his predecessor (Mike Clasper) attended HACC Seminars and BAA considered it to be important.

Stephen Nelson stated that certainly under the leadership of both himself and Tony Douglas, the business would not disregard this. They wanted to be involved in issues around blight, noise and air quality to assist the Consultative Committee.

The Chairman thanked Stephen Nelson for his address to the Committee.

Following on from this address, Members asked questions/responded

3. Iain Hope stated that the London Chamber of Commerce had supported for fifteen years, the sustainable development of Heathrow, including a third runway, as a priority. They still supported the other airports around London, which provided different niche markets for its members.

The problem of inter-connectivity had been spoken of in the address to the Committee which responded to matters that seriously worried the Chamber members, both domestically and overseas customers needed to be able to get in to Heathrow.

One of the matters covered in the address was the question of Airtrack. The London Chamber of Commerce were very pleased with the progress made at the recent Airtrack Forum. At last, people were talking about the bigger picture which was essential.

Iain said that there had been considerable debate on this matter in relation to sustainable development. One aspect that needed to be dealt with was the discussion with the local authorities over the question on the impacts. The London Chamber of Commerce were absolutely convinced that Airtrack should be part of the immediate development of the airport.

A survey carried out at the London Chamber of Commerce found that the customers and members had moved westwards over the last twenty years. Another survey that was carried out showed that they travelled from their home to the airport and not from the office.

It would be desirable to see early work on the details of Airtrack, to enable everyone to get on and establish what could be worked out between us all, so that there was an improvement in access to the West, from the airport.

Iain Hope said that he lived to the West of London and as a matter of principle always travelled by public transport. However, it was a bind.

He reiterated that it would be desirable to undertake work with the local authorities to solve their problems. Following this, construction of Airtrack could commence.

4. Cllr. Ceaser stated that he was the Leader of Spelthorne BC. He understood the benefits of the scheme, but his constituency would experience the problems, whilst everyone else would derive the benefits, particularly those in Guildford and Reading. The line would run from Woking through Staines, where the Staines Chord would have a substantial impact on residents.

It had been suggested one year ago, that a meeting could be held with Mike Forster, BAA Strategy Director, but nothing had moved forward. BAA needed to speak with the local authorities who were happy to be involved in this, to take the issue forward, as the residents were most concerned.

Stephen Nelson responded firstly to the points made by Iain Hope. He said that he was very glad that they were both in agreement as to the importance of Airtrack. However, he said that he could not state that on the one hand communities were important, but on the other hand not respond to the comments made by Cllr. Ceaser.

He would not commit Mike Forster immediately to undertake the action to arrange a meeting with the local authorities. However, it was thought to be a very reasonable request that BAA should be consulting appropriately on material impacts for Airtrack. It was understood that Staines would be an area where the development would impact. It would also be part of any public process of planning under any jurisdiction of the Barker Report that would be published. This had made the point of the performance around accelerating the planning process, but doing this with appropriate levels of consultation.

Stephen said his response would be that BAA should listen and respond. The timing of this was unknown, as regrettably these things were rather long and drawn out.

5. Tony Douglas said that the point that Cllr. Ceaser had made was acknowledged. There was a solution to this. BAA and their investors would like to work with the Airtrack Forum to establish their function in this. He would like both they and all other key stakeholders to enter into an open dialogue. The commitment as announced

recently was that BAA had entered into the Airtrack Partnership in order to enable that organisation to progress in an active fashion.

Mr. Douglas said that he could commit Mike Forster to being the key link from Heathrow in the way which they tried to get an accelerated series of discussions with the Airtrack Partnership, to pick up the very points that Cllr. Ceaser had made. The benefits had been adequately articulated earlier in the discussion. The challenges as laid down by Cllr. Ceaser were reasonable and BAA had to find the best solutions to deal with these.

6. Virginia Godfrey referred to the Oxford University Report commissioned on emissions trading. She asked if Mr. Nelson was familiar with the Institute for Climate Change Report which said that emissions trading only had limited effect.

She asked if he would he agree that emissions trading was only effective if there was a meaningful cap.

Stephen Nelson replied that he was familiar with the Oxford Study and the Tindall statistics behind this. He thought that it was quite likely that challenging caps would be imposed on the aviation industry, because it was cap trade policy. It was expected that it would be the case that this will put a significant cost back on aviation and therefore on the passengers who fly, in terms of meeting environmental impacts.

It was also expected, in a similar context, that when looked at proportionately, aviation was not something to be disproportionately penalised. There were a number of competing sets of statistics. The core statistics behind the Study were based on Tindall statistics around demand. These statistics would be shared as BAA thought they were very impressive for 2013-2015 scenarios. BAA believed that it was the most effective way of meeting environmental impacts.

BAA would build the capacity as mandated by the White Paper, whilst meeting the full environmental costs for the two to go together, if everybody played their part. This meant that BAA needed to have commercial incentives if they were to make commercial sense of this. BAA was not a public company, but a responsible private company. Therefore, they should not only subscribe to and support schemes such as environmental trading and emissions trading, (which they had already done for 2-3 years, they had a very good record on CO₂), it also meant that they needed commercial incentives to do this.

The Regulator would decide on the weighted average cost of capital. This would determine whether BAA could make an adequate or inadequate return. It must be understood that BAA would not build runways or terminals unless there was a commercial incentive.

The Regulator had been clear on this fact for the last 15 years. At the same time, BAA recognised the cost of doing so, including meeting the environmental requirements, making sure that the terminals were built on sustainable principles, as indeed Heathrow East will be. BAA believed that the cost was an important one, that should be borne.

7. Cllr. Khursheed asked if Stephen Nelson could reaffirm the BAA position, which had changed since the time of the T5 Inquiry. At that time, they were totally neutral to the third runway. Now, it had been stated that BAA were moving from the 2003 White Paper to the 2006 White Paper. They also wanted dialogue with the local communities, but yet wanted help on the expansion of the third runway.

Stephen Nelson replied that from his personal position, as the new Chief Executive, he recognised that in 1999, a Statement was made with regard to Terminal 5 and the third runway. BAA's position was that there was a change in the light of the White Paper which was issued in 2003, which BAA had continued to support over the last three years. If this represented a change from the CEO announcement in 1999, this should be accepted.

However, it should be communicated very clearly that this was a democratic process, with no sense in which development of runways or mixed-mode do not have full scrutiny and consultation.

Stephen Nelson said that the comment had been made by both himself and his predecessor, that BAA did support the White Paper.

8. Cllr. Roberts from Runnymede BC (which adjoined Spelthorne), thanked Stephen Nelson for recognising the importance of Airtrack. He agreed with Cllr. Ceaser's comments that the local residents did need dialogue with the Airtrack Forum to gauge the wider picture.
9. Susan Parsons representing ABTA spoke of the environment which was very important to all. From a trade point of view, it was agreed that the polluters should pay. It was very disappointing to note that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown had seen fit to increase the Air Passenger Duty (APD) to double its current rate, effective 1st February 2007. (Summary of Pre-Budget Report) (*enclosed*).

This would give no incentive for the aviation industry to be responsible and do something about it.

Stephen Nelson responded that he completely agreed with this statement. He had a great interest in this matter, both personal and professional. BAA did not believe that doubling or tripling Air Passenger Duty was the right response.

This action would not find its way to meet the necessary impacts. It was believed that it was appropriate that the polluter should pay. The correct set of mechanisms had to be found to do this.

Emissions Trading within Europe was only the first step. The really big prize was with the US, Brazil, India and China. On a European basis, it would happen tomorrow. Engine technology was constantly improving. BAA had targeted themselves with a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions, generated from the energy plant in the airport terminals, together with a 15% reduction on the 1999 levels, This was beyond the

protocol of a 12.5% target agreed by KYOTO. It was important to note that over that period, passenger movement would have risen by 70%.

Stephen Nelson said that as the new Chief Executive he had entered a business with a track record. It was not thought that tax would solve the problem.

BAA believed that this was a very big issue, that needed to be worked on and not just for aviation.

10. Cllr. Potts stated that many working Councillors in the West London area had supported T5, only on the basis from the assurances that had been given by BAA that there would be no third runway, with no additional growth or flights. However, it had been stated that BAA were going against that. This was not taking account of the views of the local authorities in West London.

Statistics had been quoted. It was already true that the 2003 White Paper figures were being exceeded. The impacts had already become more onerous than the local authorities were told they would be.

Cllr. Potts asked when would BAA consult on mixed-mode.

Mr. Nelson stated that he had already made his comments on the previous debate between this business and the local communities with regard to expansion of Heathrow. He could understand the position of the local authorities.

Behind the White Paper, there was a recommendation that capacity should be expanded at Heathrow. Stephen Nelson said it was not his judgement to initiate the consultation, but that the Government would be going out to consult, probably middle of next year.

11. Andy Hull spoke as the longest serving Independent Member of the Committee. He said that the role of the Independent Members on the Passenger Services Sub-Committee included monitoring the passenger facilities on behalf of BAA. The Independent Members were increasingly frustrated by the fact that although they gave up their time to attend the meetings and put in great effort, the same level of commitment was not seen locally by BAA Heads of Department who failed to turn up for meetings and did not send Apologies in advance of the meeting.

The Independent Members gave their time freely and voluntarily They often travelled long distances to attend the meetings at Heathrow.

It was explained that the issue of a BAA ID Pass to the Independent Members was essential in order to perform the role of monitoring Airside activities. The four new Members to the Committee and an existing Member had so far failed to obtain an ID Pass. There would appear to be nobody in BAA who was willing to take ownership of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee affairs. The Committee used to come under the remit of BAA Public Affairs, but now did not know where they belonged.

It was understood that both the HACC Chairman and Technical Adviser had discussed this and other problems with Mr. Nelson. However, if the Independent Members were

to retain their impact, it was essential that they provided the monitoring exercises to BAA and received responses.

At the PSSC meeting on the morning of 6th December 2006, the discussion revolved around the July monitoring exercises, as the BAA responses had not been completed and returned for discussion at the September meeting.

It was acknowledged that there had been management changes and the security crisis in August had an impact.

Tony Douglas responded that he registered these points. The past four months had been challenging to BAA, staff had been fully stretched.

With regard to Security Passes, prioritisation for issuance had been given to provide for in excess of 500 new Security Guards, who had essentially been brought to the front of the queue. BAA were looking to re-establish the performance before that period at Heathrow.

The comment with regard to common decency and courteous meeting behaviour had also been noted.

The Chairman thanked Stephen Nelson for attending the meeting and answering the wide range of questions initiated by the Members.

Stephen Nelson: speech to Airport Operators' Association, London, dated 15th November 2006 (enclosed).

Stephen Nelson: speech to Global Airport Development Conference, Rome, dated 23rd November 2006 (enclosed).

3080 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1. The Minutes of the meeting held on 27th September 2006 were agreed with the following amendments:-

Clarification to **Minute 3071 (10) Project for the Sustainable Development of Heathrow**, submitted by Mr. David Gray, Department for Transport.

The second paragraph read that '*advice that had been received from BAA in the Air Quality publication*'. David Gray said this was incorrect. It should refer to '*advice that had been received from BAA in response to the pre-White Paper consultation*'.

In the fourth paragraph, the wording '*air quality*' should be deleted from the second sentence.

3081 NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES

1. At this stage of the meeting, the Chairman took an extra item. There had been some Press speculation regarding a new computer system that had been installed at NATS

that might according to some allegations, trigger a mid-air crash at the world's busiest international airport.

The Chairman introduced Mr. Martyn Jeffrey, General Manager for National Air Traffic Services (NATS) Heathrow.

2. Mr. Jeffrey thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee. He gave a brief update on progress as NATS moved towards transitioning the operations from the existing Control Tower to the new Control Tower, which was scheduled for early next year.

He explained that the final technical fit-out of the new Control Tower was almost complete. The engineers were currently working on this. The major activity was the training programme which had been ongoing since September of last year. This was now in its final stages. Over the last few days, the first group of consultants had been finally signed off as being competent and ready for transition.

The entire project had been very rigorously managed in safety terms. Safety was paramount in relation to the systems and the documentation that was required. Throughout the project and training, experts had been working with the Controllers. Independent Regulators of the CAA would shortly sign off the safety documentation that would be provided. NATS would then be ready to go live early next year.

3. The Chairman believed that there was a possibility of a Committee visit at some stage in the future to the Control Tower.

Martyn Jeffrey replied that he would extend an invitation to the Committee to visit the Control Tower, once NATS had gone live in the New Year. Unfortunately, NATS could not accommodate the full Committee at once, this would need to be broken into groups. Contact would be made in the future to arrange such a visit.

ACTION:

NATS

4. Cllr. Cadbury said that as a member of NATS was present at the meeting she wished to take the opportunity to refer to safety issues that had previously been raised in HACC, particularly in relation to the Evergreen B747 flight where the Members had not been satisfied with the response from the CAA. The Committee wanted further assurance that a similar situation could never happen again and that pressure would be placed on pilots to use manoeuvres that were not near built-up areas. Obviously the vicinity nearest to the airport was the most built-up area.

Concern had also been raised about an El Al flight that had problems.

She asked what further proposals would be put in place to prevent either of these two or such similar situations occurring again.

The Members of the Committee had unanimously shown great concern on these two issues.

5. The Chairman asked Martyn Jeffrey if he was able to comment on this matter. The Technical Adviser had received an update on the position between the CAA and the Federal Aviation Authority. It was understood that they were going 'back to the drawing board' to re-write instructions.

Mr. Jeffrey responded that in terms of the Evergreen B747, the Air Accident Investigation Branch (AAIB) investigated that thoroughly and made a number of recommendations, none of which were directed at NATS, all of which were with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). Obviously, NATS would comply with any representations that came from the CAA.

With the El Al incident which was in January of this year, the Controllers who monitored the aircraft at all times, very successfully handled this incident before it got any worse. They had spotted that the aircraft was not correctly positioned and managed the situation.

NATS had an Approach Tunnel Deviation Alerting System which they were developing at Heathrow, which would give an additional alarm to the Controllers to alert if an aircraft experienced deviation problems in-flight.

6. The Technical Adviser said he had tried to follow this matter up with the Civil Aviation Authority. However, it had been found that it was more productive to speak with the UK representative of the Federal Aviation Administration at the American Embassy. He advised that there had been a rather similar incident in the United States, when a British Airways 747 took off from Los Angeles and lost the use of an engine, almost immediately afterwards. The pilot continued to fly across the Atlantic, but had to land at Manchester Airport because the aircraft was short of fuel. Both the FAA and the CAA had agreed that in the light of this and also the Evergreen B747 incident, that they needed to get together to agree what could be done to ensure that such an incident did not happen again in the future. It was understood that this meeting was due to take place imminently.
7. Paul Ellis stated that he wished to make it clear that British Airways had not been fined for this incident. They had acted entirely consistently with the Regulations in the UK, which were fully endorsed by the Civil Aviation Authority. There was no comparison whatsoever between the two incidents.
8. Cllr. Ceaser asked if it was possible to delve further into the El Al problem. This incident could have been potentially catastrophic. It was understood that the aircraft was flying over London. He thought it was only the vigilance of the Controllers who had realised that there was a problem, and picked this up in time. It was not known if there was an Investigation by the CAA on this incident. It was of great concern.

Martyn Jeffrey responded that the Air Accident Investigation Branch (AAIB) did investigate the incident. He read verbatim from the report.

The AAIB report concluded that:

‘The available evidence suggests that an error in the glide slope signal arriving at the aircraft was sensed by the aircrafts on board computer after the autopilot captured the glide path.

However, monitoring equipment on the ground showed that there was no fault and no cause could be found for the error recorded on the aircraft.

The AAIB are not aware of any similar incidents before or after this event. Consequently based on the available evidence, the problem was either external to the aircraft or experienced only by this flight or an unidentified fault within the aircraft. The lack of recorded flight data and the inability to examine the aircraft soon after the incident rendered further investigation impracticable.

In this incident the risk was minimal because visibility below the 1500ft cloud base would have permitted the crew to gain visual contact with the ground in good time. Had the cloud base been lower the aircrafts ground proximity warning system would have provided a timely warning’.

Martyn Jeffrey further confirmed that the flights were monitored at all times by Air Traffic Control who would take steps to prevent an incident.

3082 MATTERS ARISING

1. **Minute 3068** - Fact sheets about Gatwick and Stansted airports (*enclosed*).
2. **Minute 3073** - BAA response to questions and recommendations of the PSSC report.

Ben Morton would follow this up.

3. **Minute 3073** - Taxi legislation – BAA’s legal advice.
Ben Morton reported that he had spoken to two BAA representatives on this matter. Firstly, Steve Cumber, BAA Onward Travel Products Manager, who was responsible for onward journeys from the airport. His team were working closely with the taxi trade. Secondly, the Head of BAA Legal Corporate Office who had discussed the Transport for London Bill which was addressing the replacement and ratification of the existing practices. His suggestion had been that in the first instance, the best course of action would be to approach the Department for Transport to ask if there were any Amendments on the Bill.
4. Cllr. Ceaser referred to the heavy, lengthy taxi debate at the September PSSC meeting. He said that although this was well minuted, the discussion that was held told the Members absolutely nothing. It was an absurd situation, which was as a result of Jack Straw MP moving the London boundaries so that the Metropolitan Police should only serve Greater London.

The matter needed to be solved before T5 came on track, as otherwise a situation would be evident where taxi drivers’ could refuse to take a passenger to the other side of M.25 in areas such as Staines and those down to the river.

On the basis of reported complaints, it could involve charging £50-£60 to travel

50-100 yards.

It was absolutely absurd that nobody from BAA seemed to be able to do anything about this problem to get it sorted out. The people who suffered were BAA's customers who were coming in to Heathrow on various flights. BAA were getting a terrible reputation due to this situation. Passengers who wished to travel from a Terminal only to Ashford were being charged £50-£60. The matter must be dealt with.

Mike Forster agreed with the statement that Cllr. Ceaser had made. He said that he would take this action away. BAA needed to get some energy behind the debate. Otherwise, the Committee would be left discussing this issue at session after session of the Committee meetings whilst passengers were still suffering..

ACTION:
BAA

5. Cllr. Ceaser said that he would be happy to support this, both on behalf of Spelthorne BC and from a personal view.
6. The Chairman pointed out that the Committee must not lose the opportunity of the legislation, if it was possible to influence that, at this stage.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

3083` REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

1. **Changes in Heathrow Airport management** – the appointment of Mark Bullock as BAA Managing Director had been announced.

The Chairman said that he hoped that Mark Bullock would attend a HACC meeting in the near future.

3084 COMMENTARY FROM THE MANAGEMENT OF BAA HEATHROW

1. Discussion on matters reported by BAA Heathrow management. BAA Statistical Information had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. The BAA Heathrow Update was tabled.
2. **BAA Management** - Ben Morton gave a background on Mark Bullock. He was formerly in the utilities business. He was therefore familiar with regulatory businesses. His responsibility would be to ensure the integration of T5 into the Heathrow operation, as well as having overall accountability for Heathrow.

The role of Tony Douglas would now include the overall strategic responsibility for Heathrow, Heathrow Express and delivering the construction for BAA Capital Projects.

The Chairman of BAA, Marcus Agius, had decided to step down from his position at the end of December 2006, to take up two new roles. The management were in the process of appointing a new Chairman for BAA Limited.

3. **Terminal 5** – T5B which was the first satellite terminal was almost complete. This had gone very smoothly. Lessons had been learnt, which would be useful to take through to T5A, the main satellite building.

Terminal 5 had an excellent safety record, with the achievement of over two million man-hours, without a reportable accident, for the second time this year.

4. **Security Changes** – the latest update announced by the Department for Transport was on 6th November 2006, where a restriction was given that passengers could now carry a limited quantity of liquids, in a small plastic bag in hand luggage, provided the containers did not exceed 100 ml each. BAA had placed much energy into implementing that. It was a relatively smooth process, but obviously it could take a while for this information to filter out. Considerable effort had been made to get this information out as soon as possible to the passengers

BAA was currently recruiting and training an additional 100 full-time security staff that would be in place by Christmas, with more due to start in the New Year.

5. **Northern Runway Eastern Apron Works** – the daytime alternation resumed on 14th November 2006 – five days earlier than planned, following nine weeks of necessary maintenance work in the Eastern Apron

3085 SOME IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECENT SECURITY AND MANAGEMENT CHANGES AT HEATHROW

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.472**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

3086 HEATHROW, GATWICK AND STANSTED AIRPORTS; REVIEW OF EXISTING PUBLIC INTEREST CONDITIONS

1. The Civil Aviation Authority had published a consultation paper as a part of its review of the controls it exercises over BAA financial affairs and had invited the views of the Committee. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC: 471**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman stated that this was a detailed consultation with questions which the Committee may or may not have a major interest in. He asked if any of the Members wished to discuss a particular topic or to disagree with the Recommendations of the Technical Adviser or if they were happy to accept the report.
3. Paul Ellis asked if the Technical Adviser could summarise his Recommendations.
4. The Chairman pointed out that the Technical Adviser had recommended that the Committee support the continuance of all the Conditions applying to Heathrow on all the questions posed.

5. The Technical Adviser stated that the Committee were recommended to support the continuance of all Conditions, in particular, several of them had been raised at the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee on the morning of 6th December 2006, which only added emphasis for the need for some of them to be continued. In relation to taxis, there was a Condition imposed on the last Price Control Review at the initiative of the Competition Commission about the way in which taxis were dealt with by Heathrow. The CAA had stated that they were minded to withdraw that Condition.

The Technical Adviser said that from the discussion at the PSSC meeting, he hoped that the Members of the Sub-Committee present would agree that they should recommend HACC to continue that Condition, as there were still continuing problems with taxis.

Heathrow was required by the Condition to enter into a Contract with an organisation called Heathrow Airport Licensed Taxis (HALT). On a former occasion when information had been available on this matter several years ago, the Contract had been drafted, of which the PSSC were issued with a copy. However, the Members were subsequently told that BAA regretted allowing the Committee Members having a copy, as they considered it was a commercial matter that the Committee should not have become involved with.

Since that date, it appeared that negotiations were still ongoing, as to whether the Contract would be signed by the taxi trade.

The discussion held between the PSSC Members relating to the Taxi Information Desks in each of the terminals, which had been the subject of a great deal of dissatisfaction over the years by Members of the PSSC and some of the main HACC Members, had not improved. It was therefore presumed that the Contract had not been entered into and BAA were insisting on some improvement to those services.

In view of the discussion, it was felt that the Members would all agree that the Condition requiring the oversights and the Contract with the Heathrow Airport Licensed Taxis should continue to be imposed, until such time as the situation had improved and certainly until the Committee were satisfied.

The Members had raised a major objection when the CAA were considering the matter on the last occasion. Regrettably, it had taken the view that where the Competition Commission made a Recommendation, the Authority had to act upon it. However, at that time, the Committee knew a great deal more on the taxi debate than the Competition Commission.

6. Cllr. Ceaser referred to the body called HALT. He presumed that if there was to be an Information Desk installed in the terminals, he would be able to find out if he was unable to get a taxi at 10.00 p.m. at night when he arrived at Heathrow. Alternatively, could that be used as a method of agreeing with the taxi trade, a form of charging, which would be applied to journeys out of the Greater London area.

The question was asked that if Heathrow Airport Licensed Taxis (HALT) were going to become involved with the Information Desks, would it be feasible that they could work together with the Committee. There may be a possibility that the problems as described

earlier in relation to the taxis who were requested to travel outside of the Greater London boundaries, could be solved.

7. The Technical Adviser stated that regrettably, HALT's responsibilities did not extend beyond the provision of manning and giving information at the Taxi Information Desks.

A Taxi Information Desk already existed in each of the terminals. The only way in which this unsatisfactory situation relating to charges imposed by taxis going across the border would ever be solved would be by legislation to overcome the boundary problem created when the limits of the Metropolitan Police District had contracted in 2000, without thought of the problems for taxi licensing and operation which would result.

The initiative lies initially with the Public Carriage Office (PCO) which had not shown itself to be very concerned to push this matter. The Bill which was currently going through Parliament, would make it a requirement that drivers who travelled across the boundary must either carry passengers on a meter, which would give a fixed, known price for the journey, or they must negotiate the fare with the intending passenger before they embarked on the journey.

Regrettably, all the evidence indicated that taxi drivers' do not negotiate a fare as they should before a passenger enters the taxi. The passenger only found out the cost of the journey once they reached the destination. It was at this time, when many of the complaints arose with regard to the fares charged, and were then forwarded to the Committee.

The Technical Adviser continued that there had been a number of considerations with the Public Carriage Office. The taxi drivers' who were present in the Taxi Trade Liaison meetings which he attended, had shown a recognition on the part of the taxi trade representatives that they needed to 'modernise themselves' to meet the competition and conditions particularly with the new situation relating to Terminal 5.

Unfortunately, the last meeting that had been scheduled to take place with the taxi trade, had again been cancelled by the BAA representatives.

8. The Chairman stated the Members would look to Mike Forster, to take these comments away for further action. This was agreed.

ACTION:
BAA

3087 BAA RE-AFFIRMS SUPPORT FOR WHITE PAPER AND ANNOUNCES MULTI-MILLION POUND INVESTMENT IN ADDITIONAL SECURITY

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC: 470**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. This subject was also covered in the address made by Stephen Nelson, BAA Chief Executive.

3088 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. Virginia Godfrey asked how the Government would react to the Stern Report.

David Gray responded that there would be a progress report on the Air Quality White Paper which was due for publication in the forthcoming week. This would have a detailed account of both the Stern and Eddington Reports.

3. Margaret Majumdar referred to the timing of the combined consultation on mixed-mode and the third runway. It was very unfortunate that these two subjects were being put together, as it was not thought that people would be able to react to both of those items in a single consultation. These should be separated.

The Members had been told differing information with regard to the timing of the consultation. At the last meeting it had been stated that it would not be this year. This was accepted. Stephen Nelson had indicated that it would be the middle/end of next year.

Margaret Majumdar asked if David Gray could be more precise as to the timing of the consultation.

David Gray responded that he was unable to be more precise. The PSDH Progress Note had explained that the DfT had further modelling still to complete which would take 3-4 months into next year. Therefore, from this timing, it was unlikely that the DfT would be consulting before Easter.

The DfT would conduct the consultation as soon as they were in the position where they felt they could put together this exercise and the responses.

Arrangements would be made for copies of the White Paper Progress Report to be made available to the Members.

4. The Chairman asked if there was a known date for the next DfT Surface Access meeting. This was the only Panel that the HACC was represented on.

David Gray responded that he did not have a known date available. He had been in dialogue with the Technical Adviser on this matter. Mr. Gray said he had been put on record as saying that the DfT would engage with local authorities on surface access issues as soon as they were in a position to do so. He apologised that this had not been possible. Therefore, it was hoped to arrange a meeting in the New Year at some point, when the DfT could provide an update and take account of any comments.

5. Paul Ellis referred to the PSDH Progress Note which had stated that there were no major developments to report on Airtrack and Crossrail. He thought that from the perspective of British Airways, the major development was the fact that BAA had announced in the

last few days that they would support Airtrack. IATA supported that scheme which should be brought forward as quickly as possible.

3089 SURVEY OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARDS AIR TRAVEL

1. A report by the Technical Adviser summarising a survey published by the Department for Transport (**HACC.473**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Virginia Godfrey asked if this subject could be carried forward to the February 2007 meeting for further debate, as suggested in the Technical Adviser's report, as this was a good idea. This was agreed. **ACTION:**
SECRETARIAT
3. Margaret Majumdar pointed out that the report had stated that the Survey had been undertaken in May/June 2006. This was before the Stern Report and indeed before anything like as much notice was taken of climate change. The statistics were already out-of-date.

The Technical Adviser responded that it took a long time to organise and to analyse these Surveys. It was therefore inevitable that when they were published, they would be somewhat out-of-date. However, there was little doubt that the Members would know the implications of some of the recent problems arising from security and from the measures that were being taken to deal with climate change.

4. The Chairman stated that the Committee would acknowledge that the statistics were out-of-date.

3090 NOISE FROM ARRIVING AIRCRAFT: AN INDUSTRY CODE OF PRACTICE

1. A working group of NATS, BAA, DfT, airlines and others has produced a revised version of this Code which sets out the procedures which should be followed to keep aircraft arriving at Heathrow higher than they might otherwise be. A short version of the Code had been circulated to the Members' for information. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC. 469**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted
2. The Technical Adviser stated that certain Members of the Committee had shown interest in this topic, as the original Continuous Descent Approach (CDA) Guidelines were introduced several years ago. There had been a number of changes since that time. These had all been reflected in the Amendment that had been made to the Code of Practice that was issued to pilots.

There was some discussion at the last meeting of the Committee with regard to the problems in ensuring all pilots who used Heathrow complied with this, because of the way in which they were trained.

Following discussion with the people in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), it was interesting to note that they seemed to believe that they were the first people to start thinking about CDA.

The Technical Adviser had informed them that Heathrow had been operating CDA for some years. They had replied that their CDA did not start 20-30 miles out as it did with Heathrow, but started 500 miles away. If a pilot was flying into New York, he would commence the CDA Approach over Kansas.

3. Cllr. Horn stated that there was much debate on CDA, but no mention of reverse thrust at night. This could be disturbing in the vicinity of Uxbridge, Middlesex. It had been noted that the pilot put the reverse thrust on hard and then cruised less hard up the runway for the remaining two-thirds.

John Gurney responded to this comment. He said that reverse thrust was either on or off; there were no half-measures.

4. The Technical Adviser had observed that the Committee used to receive many complaints about ground noise. There was discussion in the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group, on which a number of the Members of the Committee sat, about noise from arriving aircraft, Vortex, ground running of engines and reverse thrust.

The number of complaints that the NTKWG had received over the last number of years had reduced very considerably, which was surprising. There was no obvious explanation for this. It resulted from the attitude of the public towards them. It was presumed that there was not so many people who were annoyed.

5. Miss Easey stated that pilots were asked not to use reverse thrust at night. They should only be using this as a recognised method for a safety reason. As regards the reduction in the number of complaints, this was probably due to the fact that aircraft were becoming quieter. They were not as noisy as they used to be twenty years ago.
6. Cllr. Cadbury asked a technical question. She said that it would appear that CDA applied from 10 nautical miles out and beyond, but what would be the impact of any change on the residents from 1, 3, and 5 nautical miles out. Would it noisier or quieter.

Nita Easey explained that Continuous Descent Approach was one of the noise measures that did not disbenefit anybody. The benefits of CDA were that an aircraft further out was higher than it would otherwise be. In addition, it did not fly long distances in level flight. If an aircraft flew in level flight it would be necessary to use more power. For people where it is in use further out, it was nothing but a benefit.

Once an aircraft got on to the Instrument Landing System (ILS), the system itself was really a Continuous Descent Approach.

7. The Chairman asked what the noise levels would be 1, 3 and 5 nautical miles out from the airport.

Miss Easey responded that there were some people who believed that Continuous Descent Approach had only recently been introduced and had a detrimental effect. It had been in use for a long time and efforts were being made to improve its use. It did provide benefit to people. There were no disbenefits.

3091 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 27th September 2006 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.
2. The Chairman asked for matters arising from the meeting held on the morning of 6th December 2006.
3. Andy Hull reported that it was noted that Transport for London had commissioned some time ago a 'mystery shopper' exercise in relation to taxi journeys from Heathrow. There was some fairly interesting comments made, which tended to support that which the Members of the PSSC had been declaring over the past 8-9 years that this debate had been ensuing. This had focused on criticism on fares charged for short local journeys. It had been reported that one taxi driver had refused to take a short fare on the grounds that he did not know the destination. He was told to proceed there using his satellite navigation by the taxi marshal on the rank.

Regarding journeys outside of the Greater London area, three of these journeys were undertaken by a 'mystery shopper'. However, as they were cross-border journeys outside of the area, they were excluded from the results that the Committee had been given.

4. The Technical Adviser stated that one of the other matters concerning taxis that had arisen from the meeting, was the fact that taxi drivers' could not be compelled to take a journey unless they were able to arrive back to Heathrow within one hour. There was considerable concern about this, which had been mentioned in the 'mystery shopper' report.

At the last Taxi Trade Liaison meeting that was attended by the Technical Adviser, there was a dialogue between the taxi trade representatives, the Public Carriage Office (PCO) and BAA. They were all amenable to the idea of extending the one hour to one-and-a-half hours. This should make taxi drivers' more inclined to accept a short journey fare. At present they disliked this, because it restricted the amount of money that they could earn, having waited in a Taxi Feeder Park for a very long time. The marshalling agents that BAA had placed at each of the Taxi Ranks were able to instruct the taxi drivers' that they must take a 'short journey'. However, it was very unpopular.

The effect of the informal agreement which had been reached at the meetings of the taxi trade, meant that everybody concerned would be working to raise this local journey time from one hour to one-and-a-half hours. It was hoped that this would make taxi drivers' much more willing than they currently were to take passengers on short journeys, e.g. Uxbridge, Ealing or Richmond.

5. Cllr. Saliagopoulos stated that Fastrack should be open at Heathrow from 5.30 a.m. of each day as advertised. She said that the previous week, whilst travelling through the airport, Fastrack was closed in Terminal 1 at this time.

It was also reported that the security queues in Terminal 1 snaked around the terminal. There were elderly and disabled passengers, together with children, who had to stand

and wait for a long time as there were only two scanning machines open early in the morning. The question was asked why there was no additional staff on duty. It was thought that this was a pretty poor show.

6. Andy Hull commented that there had been an increasing number of complaints submitted to the PSSC in relation to this problem. However, some of the complainants were suggesting that BAA should get rid of Fastrack, so that all resources could be concentrated on getting through one queue more quickly.

The standard response received from BAA was that there was a '*comprehensive forecasting system for passenger demand at the security gate and that they knew how many were coming and could therefore be prepared for it*'. However, the complaints keep increasing that the Committee received.

Mike Forster responded that nobody would look back at the 10th August 2006 and suggest that BAA were happy with the services that had been given to the passengers.

The Members would have read from the newspapers that BAA were investing a considerable amount of money to both extend the search cones and to employ more Guards with a view to cutting out the problem as reported by Andy Hull.

Quite rightly, people had raised the topic of security. BAA had made this a priority for next year to stamp out the queues at the airport. They were working on this.

It was suggested that if it was thought appropriate, an update on security could be made to the HACC Members at the next meeting. This was agreed.

7. John Gurney reminded Members that arising from the PSSC meeting, there were a couple of issues that had been raised by them.

The first point related to the level of attendance from managers with specific subjects and the second point related to the Terminal Monitoring Exercises, which the Members put in a lot of time and effort to complete. The response time to the reports was very poor. It was appreciated that BAA had experienced issues, but the Members put themselves out to complete the task and the responses should be ready in time for the meetings.

8. Paul Ellis stated that a submission had been made in relation to the consultation on regulatory framework for BAA. In relation to this discussion, there were Service Quality Measures contained within that report to passengers directly. The consultation could extend beyond the users and airlines.

The Technical Adviser responded that this was part of a wider CAA consultation. The CAA had published a 292-page Consultation Report on 5th December 2006. This made public for consultation the recommendations that it was considering to make to the Competition Commission about the future financial controls and licensing, together with various aspects of the work of BAA.

As yet, the Committee had not yet received a copy of this document from the CAA.

There was an arrangement between the Secretariat and the CAA that where they had to consult the Committee and the consultation document ran to more than 15 pages, they would despatch a hard copy in the post, as opposed to downloading from its website.

In view of the fact that the Civil Aviation Authority would close the consultation on the 5th February 2007, which was two days prior to the next HACC meeting on 7th February 2007, a request would be made to ask if a one-week extension could be agreed, to enable the Members to consider the document.

It was a very important document, as although it appeared to be discussing only finance, it did go into wider issues affecting BAA policies and plans.

3092 NOISE & TRACK KEEPING WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 19th September 2006 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.

3093 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report Figures for July to September 2006 (*to follow*).

LB Richmond-upon-Thames Noise Line Figures for July to September 2006 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

3094 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE

Report from BAA Heathrow Flight Evaluation Team for the period Summer 2006 (*enclosed*).

3095 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for October and November 2006 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted
2. Paul Ellis stated that the planning application for Heathrow East was a significant development, the Committee might like to debate this further.

The Technical Adviser reminded the Committee that a short presentation had been made by Simon Baugh, BAA Head of Government Affairs at the July meeting.

The Members were also given a document entitled 'Heathrow Inform' which set out some ideas on Heathrow East, together with an informative CD.

However, it was hoped that BAA would address the Members at the next Committee meeting with further visual slides and information now the ideas had been progressed.

3. Cllr. Khursheed stated that from the point of view of the LB Hillingdon, he could confirm that the Planning Application had been lodged regarding the Heathrow East development. However, it would be early next year before the outcome was known in this respect
4. The Chairman asked Mike Forster if a full update on Heathrow East could be received at the next HACC meeting on 7th February 2007. This was agreed.

ACTION:
BAA

3096 NEWS RELEASES

News Releases had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

3097 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. The Technical Adviser stated that an airport tour had been arranged to follow on from the meeting, The Chairman had decided that an airport tour would be beneficial given the considerable increase in the number of new Members to the Committee, many of whom may had no experience of the airport, other than going through a terminal as a passenger. This would enable the Members to visualise better some of the aspects that were discussed at the HACC meetings.
2. There were no further items to discuss and the Chairman closed the meeting

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:-
WEDNESDAY 7th February 2007**

