

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 24th September 2008 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Ian Potts	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. John Oswell (Deputy)	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Feliicity Barwood	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Phillip Bicknell	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Christopher Turrell	-	Bracknell Forest BC
Cllr. Moreton Moore (Deputy)	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Balvinder Bains	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Alan Oxley	-	South Bucks DC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos	-	Surrey County Council
Murad Quershi	-	London Assembly
Frank Wingate	-	Future Heathrow
Lynette Braithwaite	-	AUC
Philip Carlisle	-	GTMC
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
John Gurney	-	TUC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Susan Laurie	-	Independent
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Colin Mitchell	-	Independent

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Colin Matthews	-	Chief Executive
Mike Brown	-	Chief Operating Officer
Mike Forster	-	Group Strategy Director
Simon Baugh	-	Director of Airport Communications

PRESENTERS

Sean Horkan	-	BAA Investment Strategy Director
-------------	---	----------------------------------

OTHERS

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

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

1. Cllr. Ruth Cadbury (LB Hounslow), Mako Mochizuki (Independent),
Cllr. David Rowlands & Cllr. Trevor Egleton (Bucks County Council),
Cllr. Jim Maddan (Wandsworth BC)), Cllr. Martin Elengorn LB Richmond on Thames),
Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Patrick Roberts (Runnymede BC),

4183 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting held on 16th July 2008 were agreed.

4184 MATTERS ARISING

(a) Minute 4170 – Nita Easey to liaise directly with Cllr. Beer on claimed incessant night take-offs over Old Windsor.

1. The Secretary confirmed that Nita Easey had liaised with Cllr. Beer on this matter.

(a) Minute 4172 – Implementation of EU Legislation for People with Reduced Mobility. BAA to establish how the PSSC had a role in working with them to ensure that the appropriate level of service was being given to the passengers.

1. This issue was raised and dealt with at the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee on the morning of 24th September 2008.

(c) Minute 4178 – NATS to produce a monthly report of incidents of interest to the Committee.

1. There had been no incidents to report

(d) Minute 4181 – BAA to provide copies of their published Press Releases to the Committee.

1. This situation had improved and the Secretariat were now receiving copies of Press Releases as previously requested.

4185 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

Notification had been received from the LB Hillingdon that Cllr. Josephine Barrett, formerly Deputy to the Committee would now replace Cllr. Paul Buttivant as a main Member.

4186 HEATHROW MANAGEMENT MATTERS

- (a) Dialogue with Mr. Colin Matthews, BAA Chief Executive and Mr Mike Brown, Chief Operating Officer of Heathrow Airport.
- (b) BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

1. The Chairman welcomed Mr. Colin Matthews, BAA Chief Executive to the HACC meeting. Accompanying Mr. Matthews was Mr. Mike Brown, Chief Operating Officer of BAA Heathrow.

The Chairman also welcomed Mr. Mike Forster, BAA Group Strategy Director, who had attended previous HACC meetings over the years and had always been helpful to the Committee, together with Simon Baugh, who was congratulated on his recent promotion to the new position of Airport Communications Director.

It was hoped that the Committee would have a good dialogue going forward with the newly formed BAA Heathrow management team.

2. Mr. Matthews said that he hoped to attend the HACC meetings regularly, to speak with the Committee members, as it was important for the management team to be connected sensibly and effectively to the communities around Heathrow.

Mr. Matthews explained that he had said publicly, shortly after joining the company, that Heathrow was not only the biggest of BAA's airports, but that it occupied people's attention the most, not just because the UK's Press was inclined to centre on it, but because it was so important as a hub.

For that reason, Mr. Matthews said he had structured the management team to be focused especially on Heathrow. In order to accommodate that, Mr. Stephen Peat (MD Airports Division) had been recruited to concentrate on the other six BAA airports. This did effectively mean that the principal task of the top team of which Mike Brown was a member, was to run Heathrow. That was why this liberated Mr. Brown to focus very tightly on the day-to-day operations at Heathrow and not the need to be distracted by other aspects.

Colin Matthews said that whilst it was not thought this was significantly a change in structure, it did imply that he was spending personally more time at Heathrow, and meant that Mike Brown had joined BAA with a different perspective, but from an industry which shared many of the same challenges.

Mr. Matthews stated that since he had joined BAA he had identified three Main priorities. The first was the quality of the operations, the second was the programme to invest £4.3 billion over the next five years at Heathrow to improve the terminal facilities. The third, which had perhaps generated the most noise externally, was around the strategic and regulatory issues, including, but not necessarily the most important, the Competition Commission issues.

The only reason that it was thought that this was not the most important, was because there was a pile of issues even more important than common ownership. Obviously, if this was not believed, the announcement of the sale of Gatwick Airport would not have been made.

With regard to **operations**, this Summer had experienced the absence of major multi-day, multi-terminal catastrophic disruption, where in previous years this had been evident at Heathrow. On some days, there had been problems in single terminals for a couple of hours, but no major disruption.

This was a hugely important factor, which gave confidence that the operation could be run, if not perfectly. Some of that was the absence of external matters, over which BAA had no control, but it was also about an increasingly confident management team internally. Not only with Mike Brown as Chief Operating Officer, but now, every single terminal had an individual running it, who in the past had run an entire airport, e.g. in two cases, Heathrow and in one case Southampton, and in the fourth case somebody who actually had relevant, but non-airport experience.

Therefore, a significantly stronger, differently structured, flatter organisation was in place to make Heathrow work. The test of that would be the switches of airlines from one terminal to another. On 17th September 2008, a further switch of BA flights took place from Terminal 4 to Terminal 5. However, there was no Press coverage at all on the airline moves.

Mr. Matthews said that it was a rather a sad reflection on the job that he had, in that the best he could achieve was not being noticed. In many cases it was thought that this was what BAA had to be; they wanted airlines to offer great service to customers and not to be conscious if flights were shifted from one terminal to another. That was the nature of the industry. This was taken as a huge celebratory mark – the fact that BAA had been able to shift that many flights and not have any Press coverage.

BAA were feeling modest and humble, and it was hoped a touch more confident at the ability to manage Heathrow through an extremely busy Summer period.

Mr. Matthews continued that offsetting the operational confidence, we lived in a very challenging economic environment. That had a direct impact on how airline customers, who were less and less confident financially, understandably challenged BAA for better service and lower charges and also passengers were inclined to fly slightly less.

In the short-term, there was a huge financial challenge. In the long-term, airports were investments and good ones. There was a really challenging period ahead over the next year or so, to cope with probably slightly lower passenger numbers and definitely an airline industry which was suffering.

Terminal 5 was working very well, as seen by British Airways data on passenger perceptions and punctuality. The best advertisement would be in more people using the service. This meant that Heathrow needed to be renovated and replace T4, T2 and T3 and ultimately Terminal 1. This would be tackled in the next four years with the £4.3 billion investment. It was a huge and rather complicated Capital programme, in that Terminal 5 was constructed on a site without passengers using it, whereas at Terminal 4, as at 23rd September 2008, a new Arrival procedure was in place, where passengers needed to arrive at the airport and go down a level to get into the building, and then go back up again to Departures to enable BAA to replace the whole of the front of Terminal 4.

This project needed to be completed without impinging on passengers and carried out cost effectively and should end up with products, where people travelling through Terminal 4, would say that it felt like Terminal 5. Modern surfaces and light would be evident to make people feel that Heathrow was an airport for 2010 onwards and not an airport from the 1970's or 1980's.

Colin Matthews said with regard to a matter which had generated the most interest externally; Strategy, Regulation and Politics, he thought that there were two issues which were even more important than **common ownership**.

Firstly, **regulation** – everyone had stated that this needed to be updated. BAA agreed with this statement as did the CAA. Very positively, the DfT had started a process, whereby Professor Martin Cave would review this over the next year or so.

Points that BAA would argue for, would include the fact that regulation needed to encourage quality as well as quantity. It was not good to systematically fill Heathrow to bursting point, it was essential to ensure that the quality and resilience was also in place. It was a positive opportunity to debate this with interested parties over the next couple of years.

For the most part, BAA agreed with the airlines, that they wanted the same, which was better standards for customer service.

A second, important and sensitive, but difficult topic was the question of new capacity, specifically the new runway. That was a decision which was far too big for BAA to take on its own. It was thought that this was obviously a decision that the country needed to take as a whole, which meant that this had to be considered seriously within the context of Government policy.

Mr. Matthews said that his anxiety presently was the fact that people were using 3-4 different pretexts for trying not to face up to that question. It was acknowledged it was a difficult question that needed to be confronted, but the answer was not to 'dodge' the question.

There were four ways in which it was thought that people were currently 'dodging' the question.

The first was talking about building an airport in the Thames Estuary. This was not realistic, but it was a very good way of people avoiding the real issue. It would not happen at a cost of £30-£40 billion, but it meant that people could avoid the tough questions.

The second way to avoid facing up to a **third runway** decision was to say that 'a hub can be a hub without the transfer traffic that makes it a hub'. That was a seductive argument in that people needed to understand how a hub works. In order to justify the maximum number of direct connections for passengers starting or ending in London, it was necessary to have transfer traffic to fill up the peaks and troughs of the schedule. It cannot be a hub if there is no transfer traffic.

People were saying let us not worry about the tough R3 question, but just get rid of the transfer traffic. The consequence of that would be that Heathrow would no longer be a hub and people would use Paris instead. To use Paris would have adverse economic consequences for this country.

Another argument that people were using not to face up to the third runway question was rail. High speed rail links to Heathrow would be fantastic and make the airport work better. Competitors already had high speed rail. However, Colin Matthews said that in his view, they were not alternatives. It was not because there were investments for high speed rail links that you do not need a hub to work in order to take people on to their longer destinations; both were needed.

Finally, some people think that breaking up BAA would solve all of the questions overnight. It was not believed that many people based at Heathrow seriously thought that was likely, whatever the merits of the arguments over the **Competition Commission**.

Mr. Matthews referred to **Gatwick Airport**. He said that the story on Gatwick was no more complicated than he had announced publicly, namely, that the fact needed to be faced that there was a very wide-spread public demand for change, and to be perceived as the company who would blindly stick their feet in and turn the status quo against any possible challenge was not a good place to be.

BAA needed to get on with this and not wait for the next critical report to be published. Gatwick was relatively straight-forward. Hopefully, in the process, not just the Competition Commission, but more generally, the public at large will see that the new team in BAA is recognising that they need to improve and change, which includes operations and the £4.3 billion investment, but it also includes a different company to hear what its passengers are saying.

The process for the sale of Gatwick would probably take one year to complete.

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

2. Philip Carlisle, Chairman of the Passenger Services-Sub Committee explained that the PSSC was manned by individuals who were frequent flyers and/or individuals who represent organisations which represent frequent and leisure flyers.

Most of the PSSC were also members of HACC. The PSSC meeting precedes the HACC meeting and therefore requires a full day away from the office in order to attend, six times per year, which the members' companies or individuals recognise as being good value, as they wanted Heathrow to work as well as it could do.

Whatever is said at the PSSC meetings, which could sometimes be uncomfortable for the BAA staff who attended the meeting, it was with the best intention to try to help to make improvements.

On a few occasions, suggestions had actually been made that no one else had thought about. Sometimes these are implemented and sometimes modifications were not possible and explained by BAA and the Committee understood.

Four of the organisations represented were the Air Transport Users Council (AUC), the Consumers' Association (CA), the Association of British Travel Agents (ABTA) and the Guild of Travel Management Companies (GTMC), which was probably the least well known.

Mr. Carlisle said that his organisation, the GTMC, had a membership of 31. They were reputed to control about 80% of all of the managed business travel sold in the UK, which was 3.7 million air tickets per year, valued at £5.5-£6 billion sterling per year (but they did not just deal with air). They arranged travel for individual self-employed people through complete ship and oil rig cruise through media companies, financial houses, Universities, NHS, Prison Service, Houses of Parliament and Government departments e.g. Ministry of Defence. They and the customers want Heathrow to be offering a first class service.

The PSSC carried out Terminal Monitoring Exercises three times per year (every second meeting) where the members' mystery shop' around the airport, typically, these days pretending to arrive, transit and depart. Two terminals are covered by each person. Details of the journey to and from the airport with surface transport used was also reported on.

Philip Carlisle reported that sadly, the last two sets of exercises, all structured to make it as easy as possible for BAA to deal with had not been dealt with at all. He had looked at what the companies would charge for the provision of such services by consultants. He had estimated that it was worth at least £15,000-£25,00 per inspection or more.

Mr. Carlisle continued that not only were BAA throwing that away, but that as far as his company was concerned, he would not waste his time doing that again, unless BAA could get organised.

On a more positive note, there was a new set of BAA staff in attendance at the PSSC meeting on the morning of 24th September 2008, who had seemed excellent. Therefore, it was hoped that the problems were historical.

Also, a presentation was made by BAA on dealing with passengers with reduced mobility (PRMs) which was constructive. It was staggering to hear that in the month of July 2008, Terminal 2 and Terminal 3 dealt with 32,000 PRMs and Terminal 5 dealt with 35,000 PRMs. The remainder of the Terminals dealt with approximately 2,000-3,000 PRMs.

The aspect that gave cause for sympathy towards BAA was the fact that in all cases, less than 50% notified in advance. Legally, as far as the EU were concerned, ABTA or membership of the GTMC theoretically, were supposed to inform the airport about PRMs. However, the strategic and sensible pragmatic approach was taken that as this had always been done through airlines, who were connected to BAA, this was how it should be.

However, the airlines were not being blamed either, as it was thought that they had been told.

One disturbing point to note was the fact that some of this happened with arriving carriers. It was amazing to hear that people could arrive at an airport on an aeroplane who needed a wheelchair and the airline had yet still not told the airport.

When the PSSC dealt with complaints on this matter, they tended to look at this sympathetically, as it was probable that the passenger did not actually tell people that they needed this service,

The work that BAA undertook was applauded and it was felt that the problems would be sorted out and was moving in the right direction.

Mr. Carlisle reported that a presentation was made to the Committee by the CAA regarding the Air Passenger Experience on the airport. This had changed from the original format, which was to be a series of consultations and workshops. They had decided not to do this. Instead, they would fund, which was probably an expensive passenger survey at Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted and Manchester, which they would use to educate themselves about the general feelings of the passenger.

A good aspect from this would be that the members of the PSSC would be taken as individuals to write in to Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser, so that he could respond with the highlights of where the Committee thought there were good points and bad. Sadly, the subject of black cabs at Heathrow, discussed at much length by the members at the PSSC meetings, was not in the CAA's remit, but that of the DfT's. However, it was agreed to mention this subject in the report that would be made. to awaken others to this matter.

A further update on this survey would be provided by the CAA at the 28th January 2009 PSSC meeting.

Philip Carlisle said that at one stage when it had been considered to conduct a consultation exercise, it had been agreed for the PSSC to undertake this with a BAA representative and possibly one of the airlines. That was no longer necessary, but as a Committee, the members would be more than happy to consult with both BAA and the airline community about the response. However, the ultimate aim was to improve the air passenger experience. The regulatory regime might also need to be looked at, but was unsure about the sale of airports.

Mr. Matthews thanked Mr. Carlisle for the opportunity to demonstrate that the activities of the PSSC had not been shown enough importance in the past. He said that this was now historical and more attention would be paid to the work of the Committee in the future.

3. Mr. Mike Brown seconded this statement. He said that one of the great advantages of the new organisational structure was that he would have Heathrow running through his veins day and night, and whatever he could do to work with the Committee more effectively than BAA had done in the past, he would do so.

Clearly, BAA had to be in a position where ‘mystery shopper’ exercises and every type of information received from people’s experience had to be valuable.

Mr. Carlisle responded that going forward, he also suggested that BAA might use the PSSC as a sounding board before plans were put in place, as had occurred in the past. The Committee was in existence to help BAA.

4. Mr. Mike Forster commented that the output of the PSSC had been a great missed opportunity in the past. The BAA team now attending the PSSC meetings comprised representation from the management areas, transport, operational and passenger strategy areas who would look at how they would like to see the airport in the future, for which the PSSC could be the sounding board. It was therefore hoped that there would be now be regular, familiar faces at the meetings and action on the reports of the Committee.
5. Iain Hope welcomed Mr. Matthews to HACC. He said that those who served as Members wished him all a very happy and extended time with the Committee.

With regard to the progress at Terminal 5, the anecdotal reports that had been received from passengers had been very favourable indeed. After the first couple of weeks, advancement was made and it was a mixture of pleasure and relief so far as the public was concerned. Keep up the good work!

In relation to the R3 and whole question of re-development of Heathrow. On behalf of the London Chamber of Commerce, it was stressed that despite current global financial turmoil, there was urgent need for continued sustainable re-development at Heathrow and for the third runway project to be pushed ahead.

The Chamber was very active in the ‘round-robin’ letter which had been published in the newspapers listing out the firms and some had tried to disparage it on the basis that it was only 100 firms.

Mr. Hope continued that on behalf of the Chamber, he had to say that the bulk of their membership numerically were small and medium sized firms, which totalled 3,500. That was not a small number. The members kept pressing (of which the longer serving Members of the Committee knew this), on the importance of increased capacity priority for R3. It was hoped that this message would be carried clearly forward, despite the global turmoil that was going on from the financial side.

Another important issue related to a plea to vastly improve the lighting in Level 1 Arrivals in Terminal 1. All of the media were shouting about doom and gloom in the UK. Let us not reinforce this to our overseas visitors and returning citizens with poor lighting in the Arrivals Concourse of Level 1.

The far better brighter lighting at the Ticket Hall of London Underground, which was a vast improvement on the present situation of the Arrivals Concourse in Terminal 1, should be looked to as an example.

Mr. Hope said that he had studied the Capital Investment Programme very carefully, where it was noted there were items on the refurbishment of Terminal 1, but it seemed to be spread over an awfully long period of time.

Cllr. Horn had at a previous HACC meeting (Minute 4173) complained about the darkness in the lifts in the Terminal.

Iain Hope explained that he had been in a lift that morning with a lady who was trying to remember how to read Braille on the various buttons, as it was so dark inside. A plea was therefore made that action could be taken on this matter. The further progress was welcomed on the refurbishment of the other Terminals, particularly Terminal 1. However, it was hoped that it was not as extended as it looked in the Capital Investment Programme.

6. Cllr. Potts stated that he could not let Iain Hope get away with the suggestion that there was strong support necessarily for the expansion of Heathrow. He might represent 3,500 companies, but LB Ealing represented 300,000 residents. Colleagues from the local authorities also represented many other people.

There was a feeling in the past, that the residents were overlooked by Heathrow, not only regarding flights, but also on decision making. Businesses seemed to get priority. Every time the local authorities made a complaint, it seemed to be dismissed as just the locals talking about their own 'backyard'. However, the Councillors represented the residents of this 'backyard' and were interested in ensuring that they received the attention that they deserved. Certainly, it was suspected that the majority of the Councils were opposed to R3.

Mr. Matthews responded that he thanked Iain Hope and Cllr. Potts for the comments both ways, for which he thought was a serious debate. It warranted to have all of the issues aired, without distractions being tossed into the debate to drive people off-course.

The economic case was straight-forward, as expressed by Iain Hope representing the LCCI, but the residents issue was heartfelt and vitally important to them. It was a difficult decision, as in total, the elements had to be weighed together. Provided the country did so honestly and responsibly and takes all of the issues into consideration and made its mind up, this would be settled. Needless to say, hopefully BAA would have had its views and argued the case, but it was thought that it was unforgivable to 'dodge' the question, which had been 'dodged' for a good few years and not worthy of a serious country to 'dodge' the question.

7. Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos asked why it was necessary for passengers to wait so long when in an aircraft to take off (45 minutes) and the same principle occurs when coming in to land.

Also, the BAA Flight Evaluation Reports referred to a Noise Fines Fund which had raised £1.5 million. How could local authorities tap into that Fund.

Colin Matthews responded that with regard to the first question, this was a very good point. It was thought that the poor customer service from ‘hanging around’ before taking off and landing and the environmental waste and cost involved of engines running was an outrage.

It all came down to the fact that Heathrow was loaded at 98% capacity. There were different ways of delivering that capacity in a difficult debate. However, with the current way of operating, loading and the two runways, that was a consequence. The cost of congestion and overloading Heathrow was visible to the passenger every time they took off and landed. This was a big issue that needed to be weighed in the debate that had been bravely tackled, recognising the fact that there would be different views around the table.

Mike Forster responded to the Noise Fines Fund question. He said that the monies were distributed, but he had always felt there was an opportunity to make it much more visible and to be clear where the money had been spent and what it had been used for.

It was agreed that this would be taken as a suggestion as to how the allocation process might be changed. The money was not put aside by BAA, but was distributed rather ‘silently’, and it was thought that this was an opportunity to be more pointed and directional on this issue.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

8. Rob Gibson said that he had made an application at the last round of the Community Noise Insulation on behalf of LB Hounslow and he had yet to hear that his Bid had failed. BAA had not had the courtesy to respond in writing and acknowledge his Bid.

Much had been spoken of improving the industry side with the investment of £4.3 billion in facilities. However, would an increase in investment be made in mitigation for the environmental damage that an international airport caused, particularly in terms of noise insulation.

Mr. Matthews responded that the developments at Heathrow needed to be managed and placed within the limits that had been defined.

Mr. Forster said that in terms of funding Noise Insulation, a significant amount of money was distributed to local authorities, local residents, Residents’ Associations and Schools.

In terms of the application made by Rob Gibson on behalf of LB Hounslow, BAA would ensure that a response was sent to him.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

9. Cllr. Bicknell referred to the word ‘dodge’ that Colin Matthews had used in his address relating to the third runway which was not on the ‘agenda’. People were certainly not trying to do this and it was thought that the financial argument as explained was valid. However, the figures given by the Government on noise and air pollution were not correct. He said that people were tired of being told that the figures were correct. The Government should be straight about this issue and a decision should be made.

The RB Windsor & Maidenhead had spent much time holding consultations around the Borough to deal with the third runway debate, for which the process was all in hand now, but people knew what would happen.

Cllr. Bicknell stated that he was fed up of being accused that the Politicians do not play a straight deck of cards, when it was not the Politicians, but the people who want to earn more money.

10. John Gurney asked firstly, if an update was available on AirTrack. Secondly, the South West corner of the airport had very poor transport links. One of the services that BAA used to fund was the 555/556/557 bus routes, but funding had been withdrawn, and it was the likelihood that Surrey Country Council would not allow the bus service to continue into the airport.

Mike Forster responded that the rolling transport work was being prepared on AirTrack under the Railways Act. A further update would be provided. **ACTION:**
MIKE
FORSTER

Mike Forster responded that an update would be provided to John Gurney on the 555 series bus services. **ACTION:**
MIKE
FORSTER

(Secretary’s Note): Response from the BAA Surface Access Team

‘The 5 series services have been the subject of much discussion with Surrey County Council and the bus operator over the past year and a half. During this period all parties have acknowledged that the level of service offered by the 5 series buses has been well below expectations. In accordance with the terms of the agreement BAA has made substantial investments in this service over the 5 year term with the aim of helping the service to develop commercially. The 5 year agreement expired at the end of August.

Whilst the service has improved slightly during 2008, by reducing the amount of services into Heathrow Bus Station, it has continued to be one of the most unreliable services at the airport with patronage numbers to the airport remaining very low relative to the value of investment. It is our opinion that further investment in the route will not deliver increased patronage to the airport campus. However, we are looking at ways to include the 555 in the free travel zone around the airport.

We understand that Surrey County Council will continue to run the 5 series buses in the present arrangement until August 2010.’

11. The Technical Adviser referred to his report (**HACC 543**) regarding the ‘Emerging Views’ of the Competition Commission relating to the BAA Airports Market Investigation. He had recommended that the Committee stick to the broad principles of the response sent to the Competition Commission on 30th May 2008, where their competence was questioned to judge on the breaking up of BAA and what that would do to induce competition, assuming that competition was desirable and possible.

The Committee had said that it was a question of capacity and if there was to be increased competition, it was not always to the benefit of the consumer.

The Technical Adviser said that he had read all of the Competition Commission’s documents closely to be able to report and advise the Committee Members about this. In his view, the Competition Commission were not competent to be able to deal with the question. There was no one on their panel of judges who was known to be someone with great knowledge and experience in the air transport industry and their documents did not show that they understood the complexity of the air transport industry.

In relation to the BAA Chief Executive’s address on the question of the Thames Estuary Airport, which Mayor Boris Johnson had seized upon yet again, the Technical Adviser said that he had been involved in all the questions of these remote airport sites with engineers and local authorities for the last thirty years, and could therefore claim to be knowledgeable on all of the problems and costs involved.

The Royal Aeronautical Society would be holding a debate on 11th November 2008 regarding Estuary Airports versus expansion of Heathrow. Speakers are required and if BAA would like to put one up for the early evening on that date, it would be appreciated. Once the meeting has been organised, efforts would be made so that any HACC Member that wished to attend to listen or contribute to the debate would be able to do so.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

12. Cllr. Moreton Moore stated that if AirTrack went ahead, Egham Station would be closed. There were four level crossings between Virginia Water and Staines. If these additional trains passed through, the level crossing gates would be closed for longer. He asked if there was consideration to building a bridge to alleviate this problem, as the residents were worried about this.

In response to this, Simon Baugh said it was hoped that that the second stage of consultation would be at the end of 2008, which would seek views on the final preferred option for Heathrow AirTrack. It was therefore suggested that Mike Noakes, General Manager, Rail Projects present Stage 2 of the AirTrack consultation at the next HACC meeting.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

13. Mr. Colin Matthews thanked the Members for the opportunity to attend and looked forward to future meetings with courteous and constructive discussions. He said that the Committee certainly had his undertaking to be honest and straight-forward. No doubt there would be different and passionate views around the table on debates.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Matthews for his attendance at the HACC meeting.

4187 BAA CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME FOR HEATHROW

1. Sean Horkan, Investment Strategy Director discussed with the Committee BAA's Programme for Capital Investment for developments at the Airport over the period to 2012/13. A general overview of Introduction and Heathrow Development Strategy was made from the document which had been circulated with the Agenda. Presentation on '**Transforming Heathrow**' as (*enclosed*).

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

2. Iain Hope reiterated his request for improved lighting in the Terminal 1 Arrivals Concourse and also as previously raised by Cllr. Horn in the Terminal 1 lifts.

Sean Horkan responded that this was included in the CIP. There was a significant amount of money allocated to be spent on such items.

3. Philip Carlisle asked where it was envisaged BAA would be on the CIP, specifically around the construction process for Terminal 2 A and B, in July/August 2012, when a wave of people would be travelling through Heathrow to attend the Olympics. Would this be working in part, as clearly it would not be completed by that time.

Sean Horkan replied that the Terminal 5 opening had an impact on the construction sequence. Currently, BAA were working that through with the airlines as to what this actually meant. It was not possible at this stage, to reveal exactly what point of construction would have been reached by the time of the Olympics opening. Obviously, this was large in the thinking of BAA as to how they could ensure that Heathrow gave a good experience to those passengers travelling through at that time.

Mike Forster added that BAA had a Director appointed to travel to Beijing to watch how well they handled the Olympics, both at the airport and the event.

In 2012, it was expected that 80% of the athletes, families and their kit (e.g. pole vaults and canoes) would travel through Heathrow Airport. It was important to note that at that stage, only 25% of the traffic would be going through the Eastern Apron. Therefore, the whole of the airport had to be ready for the Olympics, including an Onward Travel Zone.

Interestingly, a lesson that had been learnt was that it was not only the arriving passengers that had to be considered, but also when they blew the whistle at the end of the Olympic Games that all participants would arrive at the airport at once to depart.

4. Cllr. Bains asked firstly, if a date was known for the closing of Terminal 2 and secondly, would Heathrow East be completed in time for the Olympics.

Sean Horkan replied that Terminal 2 would be closed in Spring 2009 and Heathrow East would not be completed until 2013 and therefore not ready for the Olympics.

5. The Technical Adviser said that the Capital Investment Programme document was in a very different format to the previous CIPs received into the Committee. It was now difficult to find the individual projects with the price in the same way as before, where each of the projects had a separate page devoted to it with an explanation.

It was particularly interesting to see the Traffic Forecasts on which this is based (page 19). It threw up the fact that it was not yet clear what effect the financial crisis and the greatly increased oil prices would have on this. Peaks and troughs were always experienced in the cycle of air transport activity, but this was something that was unprecedented.

The introduction of a number of North Atlantic services with American carriers transferring from Gatwick to Heathrow did not seem to have some of the effects that were anticipated.

The Technical Adviser said that he had spoken with Emirates who had their A380s delivered and expected to start their first service in January 2009, which would be built up fairly rapidly. There was also Lufthansa and a number of other airlines which bring in A380s, but overall they did not make that much difference to the amount of traffic passing through. It was thought that there was a long way to go before it settled itself out. If BAA were timing their re-development programmes to Traffic Forecasts, it may be that they will need to re-consider some of them in order to revise certain of the dates that they were working on.

Sean Horkan replied that BAA closely watched Traffic Forecasts and reviewed the plans in light of this every time there was a substantial change. Much of the work currently undertaken was related to replacing existing capacity. Major pieces of the work was refurbishment that was not necessarily tied to traffic.

Looking further forward from 2013-2018, the forecasting as referred to was key and this was closely being monitored with plans being developed accordingly.

The Chairman thanked Sean Horkan for the presentation.

4188 BAA AIRPORTS MARKET INVESTIGATION – PROVISIONAL FINDINGS REPORT

1. Report by Technical Adviser (**HACC.543**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman stated that this Item had been overtaken by events. The Competition Commission may be deliberating, whether they were experts or not, but in the meantime BAA had announced the sale of Gatwick Airport with the speculation that Stansted Airport could also be sold.

The Chairman therefore asked the Technical Adviser if there was the need to write further correspondence to the Competition Commission regarding the break-up of BAA.

The Technical Adviser responded that if the terms of the report were taken that he had written, it was not a complicated response, but the Committee needed to show that it had, and is taking note of the actions of the Competition Commission, as they would be publishing their final report in January 2009. It would be particularly interesting to see whether the projected sale of Gatwick by BAA had made any difference to their thinking and whether they would still be stating that BAA should sell two airports, rather than just the one.

3. Paul Ellis stated that the responsibility of HACC was about Heathrow. Whatever happened to the other airports, it was wondered that the Committee might make an input to the Competition Commission that it wanted to be sure, that however BAA was structured in the future, Heathrow continued to operate efficiently in the interests of the passengers and sufficiently funded to be able to do so, and with regard to the programme for the Members to discuss it and move forward in a timely way.
4. Mike Forster reiterated the statement made by Paul Ellis. He said that there was much in the provisional plans which were of specific reference and relevance to Heathrow. It was thought that the contribution of the Committee should ensure that the appropriate priorities were recognised as to how that was taken forward. The HACC was an important voice and it should be heard.
5. Cllr. Potts stated that the Committee should also wish to comment on it for the interests of the local residents. Their concerns should also be taken into account in any decision on the ownership of the airport.

The Chairman asked Cllr. Potts why the local residents would be concerned at the ownership of the airport.

Cllr. Potts responded that the problem was that any matter connected with the future of Heathrow had to take into account the interests of the passengers. However, this should also include the concerns of the residents. Reference was made earlier to the environmental damage that Heathrow caused. Any decisions made must take that into account.

Mr. Forster responded that there was more to the Provisional Findings than simplifications and these do merit a response.

4189 NATS TCN CONSULTATION – REPORT OF FIRST ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

1. Report by Technical Adviser (**HACC.539**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Margaret Majumdar said that she was glad to see that on Annex C (page 44 of the analysis report), NATS had at least taken note of the response by HACC, on the concentration of departing on the centre line of a noise preferential route (NPR). It was hoped that this was followed through in the report.

With regard to the statement NATS had made on the extent of the consultation which it had undertaken, it was thought that the process remained unsatisfactory. It should have been conducted on a door-to-door basis to at least those residents living nearest to the airport. There were several thousand people who would be badly affected and yet there was no door-to-door consultation at all.

The process was not understood by the fact that NATS were proposing this change in routing, which they had stated was nothing to do with the proposals for the expansion of Heathrow Airport. Yet, the consultation document which was published last Winter had a completely different set of routes that needed to be introduced if Heathrow started to operate on 'mixed-mode'.

Mrs. Majumdar said that when she visited a consultation roadshow in Brentford, she had asked the NATS representative if the routes would need to be re-done, if 'mixed-mode' became operational, to which the reply was yes, they would. Yet, the consultation stated that 'mixed-mode' was expected in 2010 and there were rumours that the Government might want to bring it into effect during 2009. The document therefore pre-dates it. It was therefore not understood why there were two separate sets of developments or air transport routes.

3. The Technical Adviser stated that he had spoken with the NATS presenter following his address to the Committee at a previous meeting. He was definite that should 'mixed-mode' be introduced and/or the third runway that they would need to go through a consultation of this nature again, because they would have to totally re-design the airspace in South-East England.
4. Margaret Majumdar suggested that it might be worth responding to NATS to state that (a) the Committee were glad that it had been noted with regard to undesirability of concentration and (b) that if people shared HACC's perplexity and puzzlement about the two different sets of changes that had been put forward. This was agreed.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

4190 AIR TRANSPORT USERS COUNCIL (AUC) ANNUAL REPORT 2007/08

Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.537**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

4191 DRAFT CODE OF PRACTICE ON CUSTOMS EXAMINATION OF BAGGAGE IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PASSENGER

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.538**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Technical Adviser said that he needed to submit a response on behalf of the Committee to the issuing party. If there were no contributions or questions from the Members a letter would be written in the same context as the report to state that it appeared that the Draft Code was a reasonable way of dealing with it. This was agreed.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

4192 DEFRA ANNUAL REVIEW OF CONTROLS ON IMPORTS OF ANIMAL PRODUCTS 2007/2008

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.540**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Technical Adviser stated that this debate was a major issue, particularly when it was raised a couple of years ago when the Committee were involved with the Secretary of State personally and the National Farmers' Union and others.

Some Members may have heard various News reports, particularly on the BBC TV recently. about this continuing trade in Bush meat and the adverse effects. Some of the pictures seen relating to the food products that enter the Country were horrendous and it could not be imagined that people would wish to eat this.

There had been a number of Prosecutions of people from African countries, particularly where they had been taken to Court and heavily fined, because they had entered with suitcases full of food, principally from West Africa, but not entirely from that location. As it is, any products which arrive from another country within the European Union are held to be legal. Some people get around this by taking the products from Nigeria into another European country where they are not as concerned to control it as the UK and when that is then transhipped and brought into this country, it gets through the Controls and there is no further trace of it afterwards.

Much of the activity took place in legal cargoes of freight, where it is hidden, sometimes with the knowledge of the person who had consigned it or sometimes with the connivance of them. Whatever it is, they are the responsibility of the Health Inspectors from the LB Hillingdon and not through the Agency of the UK Borders Agency.

The Chief Inspector from LB Hillingdon addressed the Committee several years ago to advise of their work in this activity. It was thought that the problem and the means of trying to track it down had increased since that time.

The Technical Adviser suggested that the Chief Inspector of the LB Hillingdon should be invited to attend a future HACC meeting to provide an update and illustrate how they coped with the matter. However, it was understood at one point there was a problem with regard to the funding of this activity, sufficient to be able to undertake the duties that they had been given.

Cllr. Josephine Barrett representing LB Hillingdon undertook to look into this matter.

ACTION:
CLLR
JOSEPHINE
BARRETT

4193 AIRPORT POLICING, FUNDING AND SECURITY PLANNING

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.541**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted, together with an Executive Summary from the Department for Transport.
2. The Technical Adviser stated that there was much ongoing activity on this subject, most of which had been covered in the report.

The relationship of the Metropolitan Police with BAA were rather better and further forward than that with many other airports.

The Technical Adviser said that he had met with Mr. Len Duval, Chairman of the Metropolitan Police Authority. By and large, he had said that was fairly satisfied with the work that had been undertaken, and that the recompense which BAA had to pay to the Metropolitan Police for the activities of personnel provision and security planning for Heathrow was also broadly satisfactory.

It was understood that the negotiations were ongoing and would take a while before they were finalised. The amount of money involved was significant.

A response was required by the Committee to the consultation document.

In paragraph 8 of the Technical Adviser's report, the measures that the Government were contemplating to take had been outlined. Also in paragraph 9, reference was made to MATRA (**M**ulti **A**gency **T**hreat and **R**isk **A**ssessment) at Heathrow. At other Airport Consultative Committees, Gatwick in particular, they are represented on MATRA.

However, the Technical Adviser said that he was not aware from his long association with HACC that the question had ever been previously raised. Therefore, this needed to be addressed as to whether the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee should make a request to be represented on the Heathrow MATRA. Also, whether there were any other points relating to policing, planning and funding which Members had in mind that they wished to be conveyed in the response to the consultation document.

3. The Chairman asked who ran MATRA.

Roger Wiltshire responded that MATRA was run by each airport and the majority between the airport and the Police Authority. It was very important that people in the process were very much involved in security, as they dealt with threats and risks and were led by the Government with the appropriate management in place, as it is today. It was thought that this was an important topic, especially at Heathrow as certain parts of the country did not have police funding in place. The relationship between the airport, the Police and the other operators understood and ensured that MATRA worked.

4. The Chairman declared that the DFT report was noted and the Members would value sight of the next published version. However, the Committee would not progress the question of whether HACC should be represented on the Heathrow MATRA. This was agreed.

4194 CODE OF PRACTICE – ACCESS TO AIR TRAVEL FOR DISABLED PERSONS WITH REDUCED MOBILITY

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.542**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

4195 AIRCRAFT NOISE

1. The Committee had received several important documents dealing with aspects of aircraft noise which require some verbal technical background to be given and sufficient time for in-depth discussion.
2. The Chairman announced that there were four matters which had not been brought to the main Committee meeting, due to time constraints.
 - (a) Noise Action Plans – Draft Guidance Seminar on 23rd September 2008 by Defra.
 - (b) Noise Exposure Contours for Heathrow Airport.
 - (c) The EU Directive Noise Related Operation Restrictions.
 - (d) BAA Flight Evaluation Report.

It was therefore proposed that to discuss the four listed items, a Special Meeting of the Environment & Local Issues Sub-Committees should be held on Thursday 13th November 2008 at 10.30 a.m. in Conference Room 2 at the Heathrow Academy.

This was agreed.

4196 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 16th July 2008 (*previously circulated*) were agreed.
2. The Technical Adviser stated that a satisfactory response from BAA management was still awaited to the suggestion by the Committee that Security staff should wear numbered identification badges.

Philip Carlisle, Chairman of the PSSC stated that BAA had indicated that they wished to progress this matter by showing the ‘given’ name of the individual. Assurance had been made that with the ‘given’ name and the shift details, they would be able to identify the person. However, the Members objected to this as a solution as it was not entirely convinced that this system would work.

The Committee wished the Security staff to be identifiable in terms of the passenger complaints. It had therefore been proposed that uniformed Security staff should wear a clearly visible numbered badge on their uniform. This would not be demeaning and would satisfy the requirements to keep the person’s personal details private, but still allowed them to be identified if they misbehaved.

Simon Baugh undertook to follow this matter up.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

4197 NTK WORKING GROUP

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 22nd July 2008 and were noted

4198 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE

1. Report from Heathrow Flight Evaluation Team for the period of Mid-Season Summer (March-July 2008) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Margaret Majumdar referred to the report and said that she was sorry to note the absence of Nita Easey, BAA Noise Adviser at the meeting and hoped that this would not be a regular occurrence.

The Chairman advised that it was understood that Nita would shortly be leaving the company.

Margaret Majumdar said that she was dismayed to hear this news. Nita would be very sorely missed by the Committee as some of the Members saw her as the ‘friendly face’ of BAA. It was hoped there would still be a person in post who could be approached with noise incidents to get a reasonable answer and not a mechanical voice over the telephone.

For instance, on this report, the question was asked as to why in week commencing 12th July 2008, there were 56 departures in one week. This equalled to 8 per night.

3. The Chairman asked if in the future, there would be a person who could answer noise related questions.

Simon Baugh responded that there would be. Nita Easey’s role had changed and there would be a central function in place.

4. Margaret Majumdar asked if Nita Easey would attend the Environment & Local Issues Sub-Committee meeting on 13th November 2008.

Simon Baugh responded that he would clarify this and action to consider who should represent BAA.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

5. The Technical Adviser stated that it was understood that Nita Eaaey would not attend any future HACC meetings and would leave BAA on 31st December 2008.
6. Margaret Majumdar requested that a letter of appreciation should be sent to Nita Easey on behalf of the Committee when she leaves BAA. This was agreed.

ACTION:
SECRETARIAT

7. The Technical Adviser referred to the question raised by Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos on the Noise Fines Fund and how it was allocated. He said that there was a group of Boroughs around the airport who had for a number of years been allocated monies from the Noise Fund. This Fund had not been receiving as much money as it used to, because there were many fewer aircraft who were breaking the target levels for noise.

If page 3 of the NTKWG Minutes were observed, it would be seen that it gave details as to the amount of money paid out and to whom.

The Community Noise Insulation Board had some money which was supplied directly from BAA. There was a Member of HACC (Cllr. Ruth Cadbury) who served upon that Board, the Chairman of which, Mr. Gerry Ceaser (Advisory Member of the PSSC), gave an update to the Members at the HACC meeting on 16th July 2008.

Written reports of the Minutes of the Board administering that Scheme were received by HACC. The latest set would be put on the 3rd December 2008 Agenda. **ACTION:**
SECRETARIAT

4199 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report Figures for Quarter 2 (April- June 2008) and LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for Quarter 2 (April-June 2008) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4200 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for July and August 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. John Gurney referred to the application for the erection of a Concrete Batching Plant on the Southern Perimeter Road. He asked if the exaction location of this was known.

Simon Baugh agreed to action this.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

4201 NEWS RELEASES

1. New Releases had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4202 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY 3rd DECEMBER 2008

DATES OF 2009 MEETINGS:

WEDNESDAY 28th JANUARY 2009

WEDNESDAY 25th MARCH 2009

FRIDAY 22nd MAY 2009

WEDNESDAY 29th JULY 2009

WEDNESDAY 23rd SEPTEMBER 2009

WEDNESDAY 2nd DECEMBER 2009 (SEMINAR)

