



Agenda Item:	Reference: HACC.517
Date March 12 2008	
"Making the case for responsible growth"	

Report by the Technical Adviser

1. Members have been distributed with copies of the BAA response to the Government consultation document on the expansion of Heathrow Airport which is entitled "Making the case for responsible growth" and are asked to bring this with them to the meeting of the Committee on March 26 2008, so that it may be debated.
2. Amongst the various matters to which BAA refers are several not previously raised in the various consultation documents issued.
3. On page 31, BAA welcomes the development of the South East Airspace Study saying that the creation of a formal airspace master plan for the South East of England would allow future Airspace Change proposals across the London airports in particular, to be more easily presented by sponsors in a co-ordinated manner.
4. Any changes resulting from this may have significance for the interests represented on the HACC and will need to be monitored.
5. Following on from this, BAA presents arguments for the use of mixed mode operations at Heathrow to provide a more resilient airport operation and for the management of delays.
6. BAA says that it is keen to see any new capacity put to the best possible use whilst ensuring that environmental limits are not breached and presents reasons why this can be assisted through use of the slot allocation system allied to the setting of environmental capacity parameters.
7. Also on page 31, BAA draws attention to the financial commitments which it will face if Government confirms its policy support for mixed mode operations and for a third runway at Heathrow. BAA would be committing to over £8 billion of expenditure over three 5- year regulatory periods with recovery of revenue not likely until 2020 or beyond. BAA considers that this raises significant questions as to whether the quinquennial system (of review by the CAA) can give sufficient security to BAA to commit to investment on this scale. It is discussing issues associated with revenue recovery with the Civil Aviation Authority and the Competition Commission.
8. Whilst BAA says that resolution of these issues can wait for some time, it concludes that an arrangement to incentivise the company to continue to invest in the proposed development during the next five year regulatory period is necessary, should the Government confirm its policy support. BAA could be investing £650 million during this period, much of it with respect to costs that cannot be recovered. BAA and the airlines have proposed to the Civil Aviation Authority a method by which revenue recovery during the next regulatory period will be achieved.
9. The document closes by pointing out that although BAA is confident of achieving a suitable regulatory framework with the CAA, it remains for Government to underpin this agreement by maintaining its strong support for the Air Transport White Paper.

10. At this time of writing, the CAA has just published the decision on the regulatory framework for Heathrow and Gatwick airports for the period 2008 to 2013 in a 300 page document which has yet to be seen. It is not known whether the matters referred to in paragraphs 7 and 8 above have, in fact, been agreed.

mgh/517



Report by the Technical Adviser

Agenda Item:	Reference: HACC.518
Date 12 March 2008	
Improving public transport access to Heathrow Airport: Airtrack	

1. The Committee has considered proposals on a number of occasions for construction of a new rail link from the south west to Heathrow Airport. The latest of these was at the meeting of the Committee on 30 January 2008, when Mike Noakes, General Manager Rail for BAA, gave a presentation in anticipation of publication of a public consultation documentation with details of a proposal to construct the first phase of a rail link from Terminal 5 to an existing rail network in Staines.
2. The purpose of the consultation is to assist BAA in making an application to Parliament for approval of an application for a Transport and Works Order which will authorise construction of the works.
3. The elements of this scheme are:-
 - fitting out two platforms which have already been built at the Terminal 5 station
 - tunnelling between Terminal 5 and Hithermoor
 - constructing a new alignment across Stanwell Moor and Staines Moor
 - forming a junction with the Windsor line
 - building a new station at Staines High Street
 - linking the Windsor line to the Virginia Water line in Staines Town Centre (the chord)
 - re-modelling the existing Staines station
4. Once this new rail infrastructure is in place, two trains per hour will operate in each direction to London Waterloo, Guildford and Reading. It is currently proposed that services will stop at Clapham Junction, Richmond, Twickenham, Feltham, Woking, Chertsey, Wokingham, Bracknell, Staines Central and the new Staines High Street station.
5. BAA also has an aspiration to extend the Heathrow Express service to Staines. This would mean an additional two trains per hour in each direction.
6. The consultation document gives some technical detail about a number of options which exist for construction of the scheme - routeing, tunnelling, work sites etc - and Members are invited to bring their copy of the document with them to the meeting of 26 March to assist in discussion.
7. There is a Consultation Brochure 1 Addendum which not all Members may have received and a copy is annexed to this report. It contains three options of a technical nature relating to the power supplies which the majority of Members will probably not be concerned about except that one of them is favoured by BAA as it will allow the Heathrow Express to operate to the existing Staines station. Local members may have some specific views about the implications of each of the options for the rail services and the effects locally.

CONCLUSION

8. Members will, no doubt welcome the scheme in principle as it will provide a significant improvement in public transport to the south west of the airport, to London Waterloo and to Reading stations which might be expanded in the future. Those Members who represent the affected areas may well wish to recommend to the Committee that it makes representations about the scheme which they believe should be adopted by the HACC in its response.

9. In regard to the aspiration to extend Heathrow Express to Staines, whilst this would be welcomed, it does raise questions about the fares to be charged in view of the premium rates currently in force and the Committee's response should make this reservation and ask for details of what is envisaged.

mgh/518

•



Agenda Item:	Reference: HACC.519
Date March 13 2008	
Landing at Heathrow of a Challenger 604 business jet experiencing flight difficulties	

Report by the Technical Adviser

BACKGROUND

1. The Secretariat's attention was drawn by the Chairman of the Farnborough Airport Consultative Committee to a report in a local paper, "Fleet Mail" asking for any information we could supply about the flight of a Bombardier Challenger 604 business jet which had intended to land at Farnborough but, due to the control difficulties it was experiencing, diverted instead to Heathrow Airport.
2. Information about the flight, which took place on 11 November 2005, and the problems encountered en route, was initially published in a Special Bulletin (S3/2005) by the Air Accidents Investigation Branch of the Department for Transport, prior to an ongoing investigation.
3. A 43 page final AAIB report was apparently issued in January 2008 but, apart from the "Fleet Mail" story and an article in "Flight International", attracted little attention. The "Flight" report highlights references to training controllers to consider the balance of risk involved in directing an aircraft with impaired controls or power over conurbations, rather than vectoring them to airports away from urban areas.
4. The incident is of major concern to the HACC because of the safety implications involved in this flight and because it once again raises the question of whether such flights could not be better managed to avoid flight over densely populated areas and because it follows a comparable incident about which the Committee made representations in 2006.

THE INCIDENT

5. The 12 seat Challenger business jet was en route from Lagos to Farnborough when some 8 nautical miles to the west of Midhurst, the pilots started experiencing control difficulties which meant they had to fly the aircraft manually and make a flapless landing in order to avoid increasing the already considerable nose-down pitching movement.
6. The pilot then declared an emergency and elected to divert from Farnborough, where the Landing Distance available is 1800 metres and unsuitable for a flapless landing. Initially, the pilot decided to divert to Stansted but from the AAIB report, it does appear that ATC discussed the availability of five airports with the crew – Farnborough, Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted and Luton. Of these five, two – Farnborough and Heathrow – are listed as involving flight over densely populated areas. Eventually the pilot decided he wanted to land at Heathrow where a "flapless landing was executed about one hour after the onset of the event on the 3,900 metre 27R runway" (the northern runway operating westerly). He had been advised that Gatwick was only 20 miles away and the closest.

7. AAIB says " In this serious incident, the crew experienced difficulty in control of the aircraft due to the trim position of the horizontal stabiliser at close to the full nose down position. Fortunately the presence of a third crew member, the lack of adverse weather, good crew co-ordination and the availability of a nearby airfield with a suitable runway allowed a successful outcome".

8. The report goes on to record that " the aircraft was given further vectors to fly north of Heathrow before making a wide right turn to position it on final approach for Runway 27R during which the aircraft flew over Central London and descended as instructed to 3,500 feet to intercept the glide slope". The commander applied reverse thrust progressively to bring the aircraft to a safe taxiing speed on landing. It was then taxied to a parking position and shutdown. There were no injuries and the occupants vacated the aircraft without assistance.

ANALYSIS

9. In its analysis of the incident, AAIB said " In this serious incident, a severe out of trim condition occurred which this crew was unable to manage but which, in a less favourable environment could result in the loss of an aircraft".

FLIGHT OVER DENSELY POPULATED AREAS BY AIRCRAFT IN AN EMERGENCY

10. In a lengthy section of the report, AAIB considered the factors involved in flights over populated areas and, in particular, refers to the flight of an Evergreen B,747 cargo aircraft which landed at Heathrow with serious engine problems after a lengthy flight around South Eastern England and the adverse publicity which resulted from the report which was published of the incident in 2006.

11. At that time, the HACC was seriously concerned by the circumstances of the B.747 flight and made representation to the CAA and some international authorities that flights by aircraft in difficulties should not be permitted to take place over densely built up areas such as Central London on their approach to Heathrow because of the possibly catastrophic consequences.

12. Paragraph 2.2.3 of the AAIB report deals at some length with the question of flights by aircraft in difficulties over Central London, draws a comparison with the B.747 incident and the subsequent action taken by CAA to strengthen the advice to air traffic controllers about the action they should take and this is annexed to this report. Members will note that it concludes "that the question of flight over densely populated areas by aircraft in a degraded condition will continue to be contentious"

CONCLUSION

13. As recorded in the Annexure, the CAA did strengthen the advice to air traffic controllers and there is some evidence of this in the present AAIB report. However, as the Chairman of the Authority said in responding to the HACC's representations, in the final choice of destination for aircraft in trouble, it will always remain at the pilot's discretion.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee endorse representations again being made to the Civil Aviation Authority, National Air Traffic Service, the Secretary of State that action needs to be taken to ensure that further flights by aircraft in difficulties such as that by Challenger 604 (VP-BJM) do not take place over densely built up areas such as Central London.

mgh/519



Report by the Technical Adviser

Agenda Item:	Reference: HACC.520
Date March 14 2008	
New Residential Night Noise Insulation Scheme for Heathrow	

1. As part of the Government's night flights scheme announced in June 2006, Government recommended that BAA Heathrow introduce a new domestic noise insulation scheme to address the impacts of night flights on local communities.
2. BAA has introduced such a scheme and the details are included in a pack, a copy of which is enclosed for each member of the Committee.
3. The Residential Night Noise Insulation Scheme is but the latest of the many insulation schemes which have been provided at Heathrow over the past 30 years or so. This one is based on the noise footprint of the noisiest aircraft regularly operating in the night quota period (11.30pm to 6.30 pm).
4. Since the scheme is intended to mitigate the impact of night flights, rooms eligible for insulation will be bedrooms or bed-sitting rooms only (which are used as bedrooms on most days of the year). The scheme will provide noise insulation for all bedrooms or bed-sitting areas in approximately 41,000 homes around Heathrow.
5. BAA expects that it will take up to five years for all eligible homeowners to be able to take part in the scheme.

mgh/520



Report by the Technical Adviser

Agenda Item:	Reference: HACC. 521
Date	March 15 2008
NATS Consultation document for the Terminal Control North(TCN) Airspace Change Proposal	

BACKGROUND

1. This consultation document runs to some 400 pages of text and maps and must rank as one of the most complex issued in recent years. It relates to a proposal to change the way in which aircraft fly over parts of London, Southern and Eastern England. As the sponsor of this change, the National Air Traffic Service (NATS) is seeking feedback on the proposal before submitting it for consideration to the Civil Aviation Authority.
2. Although the publicity which the consultation has attracted may have given the impression that significant changes to routes at Heathrow are proposed, that is not so and, although there are small changes near to the airport, the greater effects are over areas more distant and not normally within the purview of the HACC.
3. The document has been distributed extremely widely – to over 1500 parish councils, 141 Members of Parliament for the areas affected, the London Assembly, a wide range of local and county authorities, public libraries and environmental groups. Eleven aerodromes are affected and four Airport Consultative Committees have been consulted.
4. The air traffic area to which the proposals relate is entitled Terminal Control North (TCN) and, to simplify considerations, it has been divided into five consultation areas, most of which are not normally within the purview of the HACC.
5. The document lists a number of flight activities which will not change and these include:
 - * arrivals at Heathrow
 - * Heathrow departures heading west, south or south east
 - * arrivals to RAF Northolt
6. The TCN proposals address specific issues with the management of aircraft in the region that are forecast to lead to increasing delays in the future. The traffic flows affected by the proposals include:
 - * Heathrow departures heading north or north east
 - * All Northolt departures
7. At this time of writing, we have been unable to obtain the attendance of a representative of NATS to debate the proposals with the Committee so this report will endeavour to cover the most relevant of the proposals for the HACC. Members who wish to delve into the consultation document in more detail will find it on the NATS website at www.nats.co.uk/TCNconsultation which will allow for postcode searches to identify route changes in specific areas.

THE PROPOSALS

8. Work to redesign the TCN airspace started in 2004, when it was assessed that its current capacity was unlikely to be able to accommodate the future growth of air traffic within the region. NATS emphasises that its overriding priority is to ensure the safe movement of aircraft. As the skies become busier, it reviews airspace management. It is required by its licence from the CAA to meet any reasonable level of overall demand and it recognises the impact of aviation upon the environment and a key aim of this process is to mitigate that impact wherever possible.

9. Taking into account Government guidance and after determining a rationale, routes below 4000 feet have been positioned to avoid overflying sizeable population centres; between 4000 and 7000 feet, it has been necessary to balance the requirements of mitigating noise and reducing fuel burn and emissions. Whilst NATS recognises that aircraft above 7000 feet (the threshold stated in Government guidance) may well still be audible, increasing fuel efficiency and reducing emissions has taken priority over the overflight of population above this height.

Noise Preferential Routes

10. Members will be familiar with the concept of these routes, commonly referred to as NPRs, which have been in use for aircraft departing Heathrow for many years. Aircraft flying on NPRs are required to fly within 1.5 km of the centre of the route until they reach a defined altitude; this results in a swathe 3km wide within which and aircraft may be seen and heard under normal circumstances. This swathe is the Noise Preferential Route.

Precision Area Navigation

11. The introduction of modern navigation equipment enables aircraft to use Precision Area Navigation (P-RNAV) and the increasing availability of this has assisted NATS in developing these proposals. P-RNAV routes will increasingly take over from NPRs with capacity and environmental benefits.

12. The population counts at Heathrow of those who are overflown under the current NPRs with a comparison with those under the redesigned routes are:

Table C2 Population Counts for Noise Preferential Routes (up to 4000 feet)

* Current design	460848
* Proposed design	421567
* % difference	- 8.5%

13. Population counts for the redesigned routes out of Heathrow are forecast to be:

Table C.4 Population count for 2009 contours

	57dBA	66dBA	69dBA	72dBA
* Current design	249057	15553	3546	596
* Proposed design	242651	16685	3996	636
* % difference	- 2.6%	7.3%	12.7%	6.7%

14. Local Air Quality- NATS says that it has undertaken analysis into the potential effects of the proposal on local air quality at Heathrow where a local Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) exists that could be affected by the changing airspace designs.

This analysis has shown that the proposed changes will have a negligible impact on the local air quality.

15. Flight Paths and Routes. There is an important distinction drawn between *flight paths*, which describe where aircraft actually fly, and *routes*, which are defined lines (referred to as "centre lines") on airspace maps which pilots use when planning their journey from A to B. Some flight paths follow the route whereas others use the airspace either side of the route. It should be noted that all aircraft will have planned to fly along such a route but in practice, they often do not. The actual flight path taken by an aircraft following a given route will vary according to a number of factors. This means flight paths will be spread over a wider area than the route centre-line portrayed on an airspace map as a single line and, although referred to as "centre-lines", they are not necessarily in the centre of the swathe of airspace in which the aircraft may be seen.

16. Route centre-lines. The route and flight path maps in the document show the route centre-lines as a redline. The route centre-line may occasionally fall outside the area in which aircraft are concentrated during normal operations i.e. the black lines outside of the red centre-lines.

OVERVIEW OF WEST AND NORTH WEST LONDON CONSULTATION AREA

Changes to Heathrow Departures to the North and North East

17. The proposals include changes to Heathrow Departures to the North and North East of the Airport. This proposal will not affect the Cranford Agreement. By 2009, the proportion of aircraft departing from Heathrow capable of using the new P-RNAV routes is expected to be in the region of 99% and will increase in time. The heights shown on the route and flight path maps have been defined using conservative assumptions that mean they represent the lowest and aircraft would be expected to be on that route; most aircraft on the route would be higher in reality.

18. The existing and proposed amendments to the Easterly Departures to the North East routes is shown in the maps numbered H.3 (current situation) and H.4 (proposed) which are annexed to this report. The maps are annotated to show that a standard daily usage in an easterly direction is assumed to take place on 30% of the days of the year. They also show Average Hourly Usage Rates for 2006 and those projected for 2009 and 2014 together with indication of the heights expected to be flown along the routes.

19. The main effect of the proposed change is that the centre-lines for aircraft departing in an easterly direction from either of the two runways at Heathrow pass over Ealing and they become a single line a little earlier than currently. Since aircraft very seldom depart easterly from the northern runway, and with segregation in force, effectively it will be only the aircraft departing from 09R involved and the effect on the ground at this short distance from the Airport can be expected to be minimal.

Changes to Heathrow Westerly Departures to the North East

20. The departure routes from Heathrow are shown in the maps in Figures H5 (current) and Figure H6, both of which are annexed to this report.

A very small change is indicated in the centre line alignment between Windsor and Slough but with a substantial change to the centre-line as the route carries on over Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire.

Proposed Heathrow Easterly Departures to the North (Principally from the southern runway)

21. Figures H7 and H8 at the annexure, show the current and proposed centre-lines and routes together with the expected hourly usage rates for 2009 and 2014. There is little difference from the information in paragraphs 18 and 19 above except that the centre-lines for each of the runways are shown as concentrated together a little earlier in the Ealing area.

Heathrow Westerly Departures to the North

22. Again, there are some very minor changes in the area between Windsor and Slough which are shown in Figures H9 and H10 (annexed to this report) and the western swathe boundary has been moved a little eastward in the Cookham area.

Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) for Heathrow Departures

23. No change is proposed to the existing NPRs to the west, south and east of Heathrow. This section only discusses the changes proposed to the NPRs to the North and North East of the Airport.

24. This TCN proposal includes new route alignments which mean the NPRs need to be similarly realigned to encompass the new routes. Figure H.11 (annexed) shows both the current and proposed NPRs up to a height of 4000 feet for departures to the North and North East. It should be noted that the route and flight path maps already presented contain a more accurate portrayal of the worst case for the height and spread of aircraft.

25. To the East of Heathrow, the current NPRs sit over London. Elsewhere in this design NATS has sought to redesign NPRs where possible to avoid population centres. However, because the whole area east of Heathrow is densely populated, there is no opportunity for NATS to seek improvement to the NPRs to avoid population centres.

26. To the West of Heathrow, the NPR is loosely aligned along M4 motorway, with the centre of the NPR passing south of Slough and North of Windsor. The centre-line then turns North through the gap between Slough and Maidenhead. This alignment is therefore already optimal in terms of centring the route away from population centres as far as possible.

Proposed London City Airport Arrivals from the North and East

27. These arrivals initially conduct westerly approaches over South East and Central London before turning eastward in the Westminster/Buckingham Palace area for a landing at London City Airport. Unlike Heathrow, the airport operates on westerlies for 64% of the time and on easterlies for 36%. Generally, these aircraft are at lower levels than Heathrow bound traffic and are separated by Air Traffic Control by height and routing. This is primarily a matter for that airport's Consultative Committee.

CONCLUSION

28. The proposals for change should cause little concern for the residents in the areas normally associated with the interests represented on the HACC. However, in some of the areas to the West and North West of the Airport where concerns about airspace use have been rare in recent years, it may be that some Members who represent them will, from personal knowledge, wish to represent that the Committee's response should raise some relevant matters they are aware of.

mgh/521



Agenda Item: 12	Reference: HACC.522
Date: March 18 2008	
Economic Regulation of Heathrow and Gatwick airports	

Report by the Technical Adviser

BACKGROUND

1. The HACC has responded to a number of consultations from the Civil Aviation Authority over the past two years in the lead-in to the Quinquennial Review of BAA for the period 2008-2013. This the fifth such Review (Q5) and the Committee has been involved with each of them
2. The Committee's most recent response to the Authority was in regard to publication of its final price control proposals in November 2007 (HACC.508)
3. CAA has considered the responses to these proposals and published its price control decisions for the period 2008 to 2013 on 11 March. To avoid repetition, a copy of the Authority's press release summarising the main points of this decision document is annexed to this report. However, hidden in the 300 page decision are references to a number of matters of concern to the HACC, some of them referring to matters about which we have made representations, and they are dealt with later in this report.

THE DECISIONS

4. For Heathrow, the Authority has set a maximum charge of £12.80 per passenger in 2008-09, an increase of £2.44 on a like-for-like basis, representing a 23.5% increase in real terms from the current (2007-08) price cap, with allowed charges subsequently increasing in each of the following four years by no more than RPI inflation plus 7.5% each year.
5. For comparison, at Gatwick the maximum charge will be £6.79 per passenger in 2008-09, an increase of £1.18 on a like-for-like basis, representing a 21.0% increase in real terms.
6. The charges which have been authorised are greater than CAA proposed in November 2007 because, it says, of additional security costs necessary to reduce queues for passengers and the need to pay for modernisation of the two airports. It refers to additional investment, primarily at Heathrow, which is said to have been largely endorsed by the airlines.
7. The Authority points out that Heathrow has not had a new terminal building for some 22 years and that Gatwick has not had one for 20 years. At both airports it says, terminal building have become tired, overcrowded and out-of-date. With T5 and a new Heathrow East terminal, by the start of the next quinquennium in 2013, nearly two thirds of passengers travelling through Heathrow should pass through new terminals built to the best international standards. Other terminals will benefit from reduced passenger numbers and improved standards. Inevitably, it says, the relatively low charges enjoyed for many years by airlines using Heathrow will rise and be more comparable with international competitors.

8. CAA has built into the price caps contingent funding for the costs of developing further during Q5, the option to expand the capacity of Heathrow which is subject to a Government policy decision expected later in 2008.

9. The price control decision embeds and extends further the current framework of financial incentives on each airport to deliver good standards of service to passengers and airlines. The performance standards (below which rebates are paid to airlines) for existing measures have been increased, notably for passenger security processing. The previous proposal (of 2007) to raise the total amount of potential rebates to 7% of each airports annual airport charge revenue has been confirmed.

10. The price control decision mandates much greater transparency by BAA to passengers and to the public at large.

CRITICISMS OF CAA

11. There was a number of criticisms of the Authority from airlines. In response to complaints that it did not intervene adequately to address poor service quality at Heathrow and at Gatwick, it points out that its role as defined in the Airports Act 1986, does not give it a power to intervene between the times of the five year reviews it undertakes, neither does it have the power to carry out market investigations of airports and/or make references of airports to the Competition Commission under the Enterprise Act; that power rests with the Office of Fair Trading.

SERVICE QUALITY

12. This section of the decision related that the HACC welcomed the emphasis placed on Service Quality and some associated ideas but gave no indication of how or when these might be implemented. CAA has decided that the standards for SQR (security queuing) should apply to queue lengths for the whole of the operational day which, after representations from the airlines, has been set to apply at Heathrow between 05.00 and 22.30 hours.

13. Control Post queuing is a matter of recent concern to the HACC because of congestion on roads in the area of the cargo centre and Southern Perimeter Road. An initial standard of 95% of vehicles being checked through control posts in 20 minutes has been discussed by CAA. The Authority recognises that control post queuing can be a critical aspect of the operational performance of airlines when it leads to flight delays. It comments that the fact that BAA does not know what its performance has been in this area does not provide a strong reason for delaying implementation of a standard.

PUBLIC INTEREST CONDITIONS

14. A number of Public Interest Conditions have been developed over the years in which the regulatory reviews of BAA have been conducted and they have been renewed from time to time. The response from HACC to the November 2007 consultation supported the continuation of the existing Conditions but regretted, once again, that a Condition imposed in the Q4 settlement governing taxi information and administration at Heathrow was not to be renewed.

15. The HACC response had advocated a Condition requiring the provision of Onward Travel desks in each Terminal to assist passengers, there is one being provided in

Terminal 5, but the Authority has pointed out that the powers which it has do not permit of conditioning such facilities.

16. CAA had proposed to require the airports to display service quality information in each terminal but has not progressed this after since both airports wrote to it saying that they would work towards displaying service quality performance information in terminals at the start of the Q5 (April 2008) period.

mgh/522