

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd September 2004 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Margaret Majumdar	-	LB of Ealing
Cllr. Peter de Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Ruth Cadbury (Deputy)	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Mahinder Gill (Deputy)	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Digby Jacks	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. David Bishop	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Mike Cox	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Malcolm Beer	-	RB of Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Rodney Bennett	-	LB Richmond upon Thames
Cllr. Peter Roberts	-	Bucks CC
Cllr. Gerry Ceaser	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. James Maxwell	-	Surrey CC
Peter Viggers	-	EANAG
John Stewart (Deputy)	-	HACAN/Clearskies
John Gurney	-	TUC
Iain Hope	-	HASG
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Cllr. Don Lyons-Davis	-	LAANC
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Danny Brown	-	Independent
David Gray	-	Department for Transport

PRESENTERS:

Jane Dawes	-	Airside Environment Manager (BAA)
Paul Fairbairn	-	Development Strategy Director (BAA)

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Janis Kong	-	Executive Chairman
Jon Phillips	-	Director of Communications
Gill Kirk	-	Head of Public Affairs
Tabitha Stebbings	-	Senior Manager (Economics & Regulation)

APOLOGIES:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

Andrew Dryland (BAA), Eryl Smith (BAA), Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser (HACC), Cllr. Mike Cartwright (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr. Jim Maddan (LB Wandsworth), Cllr. Julia Long (Slough BC), Cllr. Christopher Knight (Runnymede BC), Cllr. Sydney Kallar (ALG), Philip Carlisle (GBTA), Roy Featherstone (ABTA), Tony Lucking (AUC), Virginia Godfrey (HACAN/Clearskies), Don Gregory (Independent), Janet Brady (Independent), Danny Brown (Independent).

2846 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21st July 2004 were agreed.

2847 MATTERS ARISING

1. Cllr. Bishop apologised for quoting misleading statistics at the HACC meeting on 21st July 2004 (Minute 2929), when he referred to the fact that there was already 218,000 car parking spaces at Heathrow. He said that at that time, the figure quoted should have been 28,818. However, it was now confirmed as 36,103 and there would be an additional 4,000 spaces at Terminal 5, making a total of 40,103 car parking spaces. Out of this, 16,000 spaces had been allocated for staff.
2. The Chairman gave feedback on matters arising from the meeting held on 21st July 2004.
 - (a) **Staff Ticket Prices**

Heathrow Airport Limited agreed to keep John Gurney informed over any development on staff ticket prices for Heathrow Connect. There had been no developments on this issue.
 - (b) **Signage at Hatton Cross**

Eryl Smith took away a request for improved early warning signage around Hatton Cross regarding the East Church crossing. Although the signs were at the recommended height, to improve clarity Heathrow Airport Limited are making larger signs to replace the existing ones.
 - (c) **T5 Parking Planning Application**

Eryl Smith had agreed to provide a copy of the T5 parking planning application to John Gurney, which had been done.
 - (d) **SERAS Consultation**

Cllr. Dhillon requested a copy of BAA's summary response to the SERAS consultation. This had been provided.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

2848 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

There were no matters to report.

2849 COMMENTARY FROM THE EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN, BAA HEATHROW

1. The Chairman stated that the Executive Chairman would refer in her presentation to the copies of the two BAA consultation documents relating to noise and property blight which had been despatched to the Members on 21st September 2004. Members were asked if these documents had been received.

The majority of the Members confirmed they had not received these documents, as yet.

The Chairman said the consultation period would last for three months up to 21st December 2004.

As the next meeting of Members would be the Annual HACC Seminar at which unfortunately, there was not usually a business slot in which to discuss such matters, it was suggested that if it were felt that a Sub-Committee meeting would be beneficial to specifically look at these documents, this could be arranged.

2. The BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

3. Mrs. Kong stated that following on from Friday 9th July 2004, which was the busiest day ever in the record of weekly total of flights, August was the busiest month on record with a growth in traffic at Heathrow of 2%, taking BAA up to a total of 6.3 million passengers per month. This was despite the problems brought about by terrible weather and some rather difficult operational aspects for British Airways. Cargo continued to recover, with growth in double figures, adding 12.9% to last August's figures.
4. **BAA Heathrow's Sustainable Development Report** - at the beginning of September, Heathrow published its seventh annual sustainability report. The report examined progress against social, economic and environmental targets and was externally verified by ERN, the environmental consultants. The results showed that very good progress had been made on water quality and employee volunteering. Other results in the report revealed that more work was required to reach the targets

All Members should have received copies of this document and feedback would be welcomed.

5. **Terminal 5** – the construction of Terminal 5 continued to make excellent progress with the pre-assembled cab roof for the new Heathrow Air Traffic Control Tower (HATCT) being installed a week ahead of schedule, with the second bore for the Piccadilly Line extension tunnel completed five weeks ahead of schedule.

A key safety target had been met when the site achieved a million consecutive man-hours worked on the project without one single reportable accident.

On the weekend of 18th-19th September, Terminal 5 took part in the National Open Site Event where high profile construction sites are open to the public. Other sites included Wembley Stadium and the Channel Tunnel Rail Link. Approximately, 1,000 people visited Terminal 5 and it was a great success.

6. **The White Paper** – BAA continued to work with the Department for Transport and other bodies on the issues that have to be fully understood as part of the case for expansion at Heathrow.
7. **BAA Heathrow Consultation Papers** – at the last meeting, it was announced that BAA were preparing to publish two consultation papers. These were launched on 21st September 2004 – one will address the protection of local people from the noise impact of the existing airport, the other will seek to address potential uncertainty for local communities on the local property market in the context of possible third runway development.

BAA genuinely wish to hear people's views, in order that the BAA proposals can be refined after the consultation process and implement fair and effective schemes as soon as possible.

BAA propose two schemes to address possible blight. The first would apply for those residents inside a new boundary and the other was for those residents immediately outside. The schemes are voluntary and were better than statutory arrangements. Although it would be some time before BAA were in a position to know whether they would apply for a third runway, they did not want local residents to be monetarily affected by the possibility of property blight. BAA want to make sure they are doing the right thing for the residents. Therefore, for homeowners inside the area earmarked for the third runway, BAA would apply a Voluntary Property Purchase Scheme and give a transferable written guarantee, to buy affected homes at a price, index-linked to Summer 2002, plus 10%. This scheme would be triggered only once the decision was taken to progress a planning application for a third runway.

For homeowners living just outside the new boundary, because they could be affected by medium to high noise levels, that is the 66 dBA leq noise contour, BAA would apply a

Homeowners Support Scheme, which guaranteed that BAA would buy eligible properties, at index-linked prices. This scheme would be triggered only once permission for another runway had been granted.

At present, it was not possible to publish a map to indicate the boundary for these schemes because work was still progressing on this and would be included in the Interim Master Plan to be published in Spring 2005.

In the meantime, BAA wish to consult on the principles of these schemes to ensure they are fair, irrespective of exactly where the boundaries are.

In relation to dealing with existing airport noise, BAA are consulting on two schemes, aimed at protecting local communities. That is, from the impacts of noise from today's operations. The first is to provide help for noise sensitive buildings, such as schools and the other is to help any resident who lived in the highest noise contour to relocate, if they chose to do so.

These new proposals were in addition to the already established Voluntary Noise Insulation Scheme, which to date had seen 4,500 homes and six local schools assisted with noise insulation at a cost of £14 million.

The first of these new schemes being proposed, is to help insulate schools across a wider noise contour, that is the 2002 63 dBA leq noise contour, where it is believed there are forty schools which fall into this category. The second scheme is to cover residents in the 69 dBA leq noise contour where BAA would provide financial assistance up to a maximum of £10,000 for eligible home owners who wish to relocate.

BAA are trying to make it as easy as possible for stakeholders to take part in the consultation. The documents will be available on the BAA website, by a freephone Hotline, by posting copies to many local residents and also the documents would be printed in various different languages.

The consultation period lasts for three months until the 21st December 2004, after which time, the responses will be reviewed and assimilated by an external consultant, in order that the details can be finalised and published in 2005.

8. **Business Traveller Awards 2004** – BAA won the Award for 'Best Airport in Europe' at the Business Traveller Awards 2004. BAA were also voted third in the 'World's Best Airport' category, just after Singapore and Hong Kong.
- 8.1 Following on from this report, Members asked questions/responded.
- 8.2 Peter Viggers referred to the Traffic Statistics, where it had been noted that over the three months, average loadings for aircraft were 155. What proposals, if any, should be made that BAA could influence, to concentrate more passengers into a fewer number of flights, by having
 - a fuller aircraft. It was suggested that as some flights were only two-thirds full, a strong effort should be made to get the loadings up, which would probably mean the sharing of aircraft, with passengers taking the first available flight to their destination, rather than waiting for one for many hours.

Mrs. Kong responded that this was a very insightful comment, because it was absolutely the challenge to get passengers on fewer aircraft. Therefore most of the strategies were clustered

around exactly that point. The first strategy dealt with the A380's and positively encouraged these to Heathrow.

It was correct to say that the Boeing 7E7 was indeed a major challenge as it had the capacity of a 767, but would take up the space on the ground of a 747.

Another aspect that the strategies were focused towards, was the clustering of alliances together, to make the best use of them and the airlines, as from this would come consolidation and co-sharing which could benefit all.

8.3 John Stewart commented that BAA was creeping up towards the 480,000 cap in a way that was not evident a year or two ago. The question was asked how this would be managed?

8.4 Cllr. Majumdar noted the number of 'Go Arouns' in August 2004 (63) which was more than expected, as a year or so ago, BAA quoted far fewer than this average of 30. the question was asked, had there been a great increase and why particularly were there so many in August 2004 (2 per day).

Mrs. Kong replied that she regarded two per day was not an issue and this was a perfectly normal operation. It was not an unsafe practice and showed an airport working well and to its full capacity. Basically, weather would be the cause of a 'Go Around'.

8.5 Iain Hope congratulated on the Safety Award for the Terminal 5 site. He referred to Item 9 of the Report – the London 2012 Olympic Bid and the support of Heathrow's parent company BAA plc. He thought this was excellent and hoped it would be pointed out, as a major partner in this, that there was a need for landside transport developments on from the airports. He was particularly perturbed to see the threat of a cutback to the Gatwick Express.

Heathrow had a great deal to contribute as an airport to this Bid and in relation to Crossrail. He felt that the Olympic Bid could be used as a lever to achieve this.

8.6 Cllr. Gill referred to the BAA Noise and Vortex Insulation Schemes, but despite requesting information on these one year ago, no advice had been forthcoming.

Mrs. Kong apologised for this and said that this matter would be addressed immediately after the meeting and she would come back to the Committee with the findings.

8.7 Cllr. de Vic Carey stated that despite all efforts to obtain the history on these schemes, the residents in his borough did not know what was going on in relation to availability of noise schemes, nor what noise was covered. There was total confusion.

8.8 Cllr. Cadbury confirmed that in relation to the Vortex Scheme, BAA had visited LB Hounslow to present to Councillors the current up-to-date position on this. However, it was not known if the information leaflets on the Vortex Scheme had been put in the libraries yet.

However, what was not known was the current position on the Home Insulation Scheme because not a lot of publicity had been seen on this and asked if houses were still eligible, as it was a very old scheme which meant that houses which were insulated previously would need improvements if their original insulation failed.

8.9 Cllr. Jacks asked if it was in order for the Committee to endorse the London Olympic Bid 2012.

The Chairman said it was hoped that at the HACC Seminar on 29th November 2004, a speaker would be available from the Olympic Bid team. This might be the appropriate time to pass a resolution of endorsement if this was agreed and would give the Members time to consider it.

- 8.10 Cllr. Bennett asked when the decision would be made in relation to the Olympic Bid.

Cllr. Cadbury commented that the Bid document would be submitted in mid-November 2004, in effect completed. The IOC visit, which was very important, if successful in the Bid, would be at some point in February or March of next year. Discussions may take place in terms of that in relation to street dressing. There would be five days when evaluations would take place and the decision made in July 2005 in Singapore..

- 8.11 Paul Ellis spoke in relation to the trend in the number of passengers in an aircraft. If the numbers presented were studied, the passenger numbers were going up by 5%-6% per year with movements at only 1%-2% per year. The trends that can be seen, are necessary to fill up the extra capacity that will be available. There were two important reasons for this, firstly, the average loading for aircraft was rising quite sharply and because of the load factor, although the aircraft size had not changed a great deal in this time, the average number of passengers on the aircraft had still continued to rise. Secondly, there was a switch from short-haul to long-haul which was ongoing and it would be seen that the 150 seater was being replaced. If it was a small long-haul aircraft it would be a 250 seater, if it was a big long-haul aircraft it would be a 400 seater and further progress was being made in this respect.

In respect of the London Olympic Bid 2012, it would be hoped that decision makers would be brought to Heathrow Airport and shown Terminal 5, which by that time, would be fully built and available for such an event. It would be real show-case to be able to attract people and illustrate that we can provide and deliver top-class facilities for people who are coming into the country to visit the Olympic Games.

- 8.12 The Chairman referred to the consultation documents on property blight and noise, for which there is a three-month consultation period.

The question was put to the Members if they wished to have a special Committee meeting arranged to look at these documents or to respond individually or put an hour aside at of the Seminar to address this matter.

The Members responded that they would prefer to cover this subject at the Seminar.

- 8.13 Cllr. Cadbury said she expected that the local authorities affected would hold their own specific meetings relating to this subject during the consultation period and felt it was not necessary to have a separate HACC meeting as it did not affect a large number of the Members on the Committee.

- 8.14 Cllr. Khursheed said he believed it would be best if the subject of property blight and noise was not discussed at Sub-Committee meeting. It must be appreciated that a number of the Members had yet to receive the consultation documents, after which they would be taken back to the Council.

Cllr. Khursheed said the Members of HACC were not representing themselves, but the particular borough and had to ensure that the views of that borough were brought into the discussion.

The Chairman suggested that a slot could be allocated at the Seminar, which could commence earlier, in the morning if necessary, for those interested in attending.

This was agreed.

- 8.15 Cllr. Beer stated that the proposals were good for mitigating aircraft noise in the day-time, but the big problem was night-time. It was felt that if night flights were apparent, communities would appreciate some form of sound-proofing to enable people to sleep.

It was also pointed out that the T5 visits were grand but lacked publicity. Many residents would have appreciated the opportunity to attend but were not aware. It was suggested that next time Terminal 5 visits were organised, this could be borne in mind.

2850 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE

1. *Presentation by Jane Dawes, BAA Airside Environment Manager (enclosed).*

Jane Dawes said the aim of the presentation was to explain the background and administration on the night-time flying restrictions at Heathrow.

The Department for Transport was “designated” under the Civil Aviation Act 1982 for Heathrow, Stansted and Gatwick. What this meant was the Secretary of State took responsibility for the control of noise at each of these airports and in order to support that made specific measures under the Act to try and combat noise, one of these being the Night Flight Restrictions Regime.

There was often confusion regarding night flying restrictions at Heathrow Airport. It was confirmed there had never been a ban on night flights. However, there had been a variety of restrictions since 1962 in various formats. The current format was introduced and put in place in 1993 and was unique in the way that it was structured and had since been copied into another European Airports, such as Madrid and Brussels.

The current format was based on the control on the number of movements and aircraft types. There are peak periods that sit within the format as a restriction and often get easily confused.

The first is the night period (NP) which runs from 23:00 hrs.- 07:00 hrs. local time. This is based on a restriction on aircraft type. Within that is the Night Quota Period (NQP) which runs from 23:30 hrs. - 06:00 hrs. local time. This was based on a restriction of aircraft type, but also a restriction on aircraft movements.

The Night classification of aircraft type is based on noise classification data which is broken down into categories within each aircraft type and engine, dependent on whether it was taking-off or landing. Some types are exempt.

The main restrictions - QC8 and QC16 types are not scheduled to operate throughout the night-time period 23:00 hrs. - 07:00 hrs. However, depending on the circumstances, if they were delayed, they could operate during this period. With regard to the Night Quota Period, 23:30 hrs. - 06:00 hrs. period, within the Department for Transport restrictions, all aircraft, up to and including QC4 can be scheduled to operate within this period.

At Heathrow, the airlines had voluntarily agreed with BAA that they would operate a QC4 scheduling ban and do not schedule QC4 operations during 23:30 hrs.- 06:00 hrs. Also, within that Night Quota Period between 23.30 hrs. - 06:00 hrs. there was a limit on the number of movements and the amount of quota that can be used per Season..

The movement and quota limits allocated to each of these Seasons is not per night/week/month. There are two Seasons which run, Summer and Winter.

Neither of these limits must be exceeded at the end of the Season. However, a certain amount of flexibility was allowed. If one of the Seasons is shorter or longer running, or the time changes from GMT to BMT, 5% was allowed to be carried over from the quota.

Whilst BAA was not responsible for the policy surrounding the night flight restrictions, the Department for Transport places the responsibility on BAA to manage the restrictions, the movements and the quota count allocations between the airlines and also the reporting of the

usage back to the Department for Transport and the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee. The Department for Transport in turn, regularly monitors and audits the way in which this is carried out to ensure proper use of the system.

At the last HACC meeting in July, a query had been raised by Cllr. Majumdar in regard to the number of flights that occurred at night compared to the number of movements against the limit, as they had differed in the last usage report presented to the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

It was explained that this resulted, when in exceptional, strictly controlled circumstances, the Department for Transport do extend or disregard some movements from these limits. These particularly related to emergencies when a danger to health and life was apparent, perhaps to a passenger that had fallen ill on board an outbound aircraft that had departed before the night period, but the only option was to return to Heathrow.

Other areas would be delays which were likely to lead to serious congestion at the airport or serious hardship or suffering to passengers or animals and delays which had resulted from widespread and prolonged disruption of air traffic.

There were other dispensations that the Department for Transport allowed e.g. related to VIP flights where UK and foreign VIPs such as the Royal Family, Heads of State, Ministers and Politicians were entering the Country, relief flights, military aircraft under specific circumstances, e.g. at war or civil aircraft likely to be affected by hostilities that need to return imminently.

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

2. Cllr. Majumdar queried the point regarding the hardship to passengers. If a flight was delayed, e.g. it should have taken off at 22:30 hrs. but did not arrive until that time and was delayed until 23:45 hrs. obviously if it was unable to take off, 150 passengers would find themselves stuck at Heathrow overnight. It gave the impression that any time that this occurred, an aeroplane would be allowed to take off.

It was stated that on 5th August 2004, in the Ealing vicinity there were six easterly take-offs overhead between 23:30 hrs. – 24:00 hrs. and two in the half-hour following that which did not take into account those others that turned to the right or straight ahead. This was considered unacceptable but the presentation gave the impression this was perfectly normal.

Jane Dawes reassured that a departure would not normally occur during that period at night, purely because of a flight being delayed. Serious hardship was considered to be related to passengers stuck within a terminal for over a 24-hour period, where there are so many delays at the airport there was no hotel accommodation available in the area to take them.

Mrs. Kong added that the point raised by Cllr. Majumdar was a serious one. However, she assured the Committee that BAA regularly asked aircraft to turn back on the taxiways when it was thought that they would not meet the 23:30 hrs. deadline, because it would be known there was insufficient quota and it would be necessary to return to the terminal, de-bus the passengers and send them to hotels. It happened regularly, but BAA did not cavalierly allow dispensations.

3. Cllr. Majumdar asked when there was a dispensation and the aeroplane was allowed to take-off, did this count as the quota, as it appeared that conflicting information was relayed to the Committee.

Jane Dawes said in answer to this query, if an aircraft was actually late departing due to serious congestion and it was considered to be disregarded or exempt, it would be included in the count. However, at Heathrow, for late running aircraft, an amount of movement allocation is allowed, e.g. if an aeroplane had been delayed and wished to operate in the night quota period, then this would have to be operated against the limit quota. Only in strictly controlled, exceptional circumstances they might be disregarded.

Mrs. Kong made it clear that most of the aircraft movements going overhead would be controlled within the quota. The dispensation aircraft were few and far between.

4. Cllr. Khursheed asked, in relation to dispensation that was allowed in exceptional circumstances, as laid down by the Department for Transport, who made the decision to allow an aeroplane to take-off or otherwise?

Jane Dawes said in order for the aircraft to take-off, this was at the discretion of BAA.

5. Cllr. Bennett asked if BAA were satisfied with the current QC system as it was understood that the CAA had established that not all the measurements taken were correct and therefore was this the best way to do this.

The Chairman said he sat on a noise management advisory committee (ANMAC), run by the Department for Transport, who regularly reviewed whether there should be a replacement for the current QC system. It had recently been affirmed that the QC system in place was the best they could offer.

6. Cllr. Maxwell believed that there was a disparity between quotas and movements in the QC system and used to disguise the movements within an alleged quota system.
7. Cllr. Cadbury said the reality for those residents living under the landing paths, was that there was approximately sixteen flights between 04.00 hrs.- 06.00 hrs. each day which appeared to be scheduled long-haul 747's. The question was asked, what is the limit of flights between 06.00 hrs. - 07.00 hrs. as it appeared there was no limit? Before 06.00 hrs. the night quota period was applicable, but between 06.00 hrs. - 07.00 hrs. it was a very busy period and flights could be observed landing on both runways at the same time on occasions..

Jane Dawes responded there was no limit on movements or quota between the 06.00 hrs - 07.00 hrs. period. It was only applicable between 23.30 hrs. - 06.00 hrs. Between 06.00 hrs.- 07.00 hrs. a scheduling ban on the QC8 and QC16 aircraft was in place.

8. Cllr. Jacks asked what was the ratio between quota flights and additional (emergency) flights?

Jane Dawes replied she would investigate the figures and inform the Committee and Cllr. Jacks.

9. Cllr. de Vic Carey asked who monitored the night quota usage and what is the sanction?

Jane Dawes replied the Department for Transport were responsible for the policy and BAA were responsible for managing the allocation of those movements. An audit was carried out to ensure BAA were using the system properly. There was an appreciative amount of quota in relation to the number of movements allocated and the limits had never been breached, therefore the sanction had never been invoked..

10. Mrs. Kong stated that if aircraft or airlines do not have the quota and they are not going to meet the deadline before the 23:30 hrs. they simply do not fly, regardless of the quota.
11. Cllr. Cox asked as BAA were monitoring the system was there also an independent assessor?

Mrs. Kong said the Department for Transport monitored BAA very closely on this subject on an almost daily basis.

David Gray added, as had been explained, the Department for Transport set the regime for the policy and delegated the administration to BAA and kept a close eye on it. He said the fact that the regime was operated within the limits set, should speak for itself.

12. Cllr. de Vic Carey said that the suspicion was that the system did not work and was regularly breached.
13. Cllr. Maxwell said that an independent outside body should be appointed to monitor the system and report back to the operators.

Mrs. Kong said that from the discussion, there was clearly suggestions that BAA were not applying the system in a fair way. As a result, although it was not felt to be necessary, if there was something that the members wished to receive third party information on, this could be arranged.

Mrs. Kong added that she accepted the point that the discussion had centred on delayed departures and was well aware that most of the residents were worried about early morning arrivals.

14. Paul Ellis said that the airlines tracked the flights on a daily basis.

In terms of auditing, the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group received regular updates. If required, different formats can be supplied.

15. Cllr. Beer said the presentation and discussion had centred on late take-offs. However, the problem was that twice as many flights (35) were incoming to that scheduled (16) in valuable sleeping time and did not get recorded.
16. Roger Wiltshire said in relation to early morning flights, the airlines also controlled the movements on a daily basis and rumours of doubling the number of flights were not true. Airlines had to keep within the schedule.

2851 CONSULTATION BY GOVERNMENT ON NIGHT FLYING RESTRICTIONS AT THE BAA LONDON AIRPORTS

1. Stage 1 of Consultation on Restrictions to apply from 30th October 2005.
A copy of this document, together with the Department for Transport News Release had been distributed to each Member of the Committee with a request made to bring the consultation document to the meeting to debate the contents.
2. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 413**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted
3. The Chairman reported the consultation was unusually, being conducted in two stages and this was Stage 1. It was understood that Stage 1 did not cover such things as the length of the night quota period, movement limits or noise quotas. These would be considered in Stage 2 of the consultation.
4. David Gray confirmed this was correct and complimented the Technical Adviser on his excellent summary report outlining the purpose of the consultation. At this stage, the Department for Transport was tentatively seeking views on some of the issues already mentioned by the Committee about the extent of night flights, what are the real benefits to airlines and how a handle can be gained on these important issues and try to narrow the areas of disagreement.

Views of objectives were also being sought. There were perhaps 24 specific questions in the consultation paper which were summarised towards the back of the document. All of this information will assist in the preparation of Stage 2 of the consultation to be published in the first part of next year, which will cover key questions on night quota usage, movement limits and noise quotas.

5. The Chairman said that the questions that needed addressing were on page 31 and 32 of the consultation document. A response was required by 29th October 2004. The Committee were asked how they wished to work through the questions and if any Member had a major contribution at this stage.

6. Cllr. Cadbury said that based on the contribution at the time of the third runway consultation, she felt it was very difficult for a Committee such as HACC to have a view, when each of the constituent Members had their own unique views about their responses. Both she and her colleagues representing the LB Hounslow did not feel able to put their names to a response on behalf of the Committee, given they had not yet had the opportunity to discuss this as a local authority.

Cllr. Cadbury was happy to inform herself and get information about the issue and views, but had real doubts as to the Committee arriving at one view as a common denominator.

The Chairman stated there may be a view on certain questions and no consensus on others, but it was known that the Department for Transport did value any response received from HACC to published consultations and these responses were considered carefully.

7. John Stewart endorsed the statement made by Cllr. Cadbury. A consensus may be reached on minor questions but not on the more important questions. To get a consensus on a subject like night flights would really be quite difficult.

8. The Chairman acknowledged this, but said if the summary of questions on page 31 were studied, these were only asking if there was there anything that had been left out or were there any comments on the assessment described in Annex B.

9. Cllr. Majumdar said that in relation to Q1, the obvious thing that had been left out was the question of phasing out of night flights altogether, which people had been seeking for a very long time.

10. John Stewart confirmed this was also the view of HACAN/Clearskies. He thought that whatever one's view on the phasing out or a ban, it was a real flaw of the consultation document that this question had not been considered. Another big flaw that could be seen was that the Department for Transport were asking for views, particularly of the airlines, on the economic benefits of night flights. It was very disappointing to see that the consultation document had been published in advance of the Department for Transport having carried out some form of assessment on the economic benefits.

He added that he believed this was major flaw in the process. If a document is to be put forward talking about night flights, not talking about a ban, the logical thing would be to have carried out some homework on the economic benefits, before the document was published, rather than afterwards.

11. Paul Ellis said that the main point was that the airlines had already given up a huge amount already, in terms of restrictions on operations and the country was bearing the consequences of

Heathrow being outdone by other continental hubs, who had a much more liberal arrangement in terms of night flying.

12. Iain Hope spoke on behalf of the London Chamber of Commerce. He said his Committee had put forward the best views that they could on a balanced basis. There could be a major economic impact and he was sorry that they appeared to be the only body that had replied to this important issue.
13. Cllr. Khursheed confirmed the LB Hillingdon were looking closely at this issue with its neighbouring boroughs and were hoping to be in a position to respond to the consultation before the deadline. Having said that, if the document was studied carefully, reading between the lines, it looked clear that the Government did not intend to phase out night flights as suggested by the Terminal 5 Inspector at the T5 Inquiry.
14. Cllr. Maxwell said Surrey CC were of the same view and were looking at mitigation and the alleviation of noise from night flights. He asked, from what had been discussed, was it to be understood that as only the first stage was to be addressed in the consultation, issues such as sleep disturbance would not be highlighted.

David Gray said he understood that there was still ongoing work relating to sleep disturbance which would obviously be very relevant to the key decision to this particular work. It was reiterated that the point of the Stage 1 consultation was to obtain further information and provide the evidence base upon which the Department for Transport will then take a decision about quantum and quota.

It was not seeking at this stage to rule in or rule out questions about bans and that is the reason why this subject was not mentioned in this document.

The Chairman added that at this point in time, sleep disturbance was not part of this particular consultation but may be included for Stage 2.

15. Cllr. Ceaser agreed that the subject of sleep disturbance was a significant factor when looking at night flights. Discussion had ensued regarding the economic benefits, but not on the disbenefits. It was stated that if a resident was woken up every morning at 04:00 hrs. by aircraft coming across, they would not be able to work at their full capacity during the forthcoming day.

He added. the important factor was not whether the QC counts were tinkered with, but that there should be an absolute limit on movements.

16. John Gurney stated that for the people who worked at the airport, their livelihood was dependent upon the trade at Heathrow. Since the 1970's the noise levels had gone down and an even balance had to be met between people being able to work and bringing money to the Councils, as, if people do not work at the airport, the Councils would not receive revenue.
17. John Stewart said that arguments and discussions could be undertaken as to whether it was economically beneficial or not, but the point to be recognised was the fact the document was fatally flawed because a major consultation had been launched without the homework being carried out beforehand on the economics of night flights.

It was not good enough for the Department for Transport to say 'they think' a sleep deprivation study would be undertaken and 'they think' that it might be available for Stage 2 of the consultation. These were fundamentals on which decisions should be taken and only once this evidence was received, could a proper discussion and response to the consultation be carried out.

18. The Chairman asked if any Member had a specific answer they wished to propose to any of the nine questions in the consultation document, at this stage.

No Member wished to put forward a response at this stage.

19. Cllr. Beer asked for clarification on Annex A, Code of Practice. item 1 on page 35. which stated *'the Code of Practice will be to consult widely throughout the process, allowing a minimum of 12 weeks for written consultation at least once during the development of the policy'*.

It was understood that we were currently in the middle of a 12 week period and did this mean that there would be any time for consultation in Stage 2 for a further 12 weeks.

David Gray responded that Stage 2 was a completely separate consultation exercise and would be launched in the first half of next year and allow at least 12 weeks for responses.

20. Cllr. Maxwell referred to Q6 part (b) on page 31 *'retain the minus 9EPNdB adjustment for arrivals'* and would like to see added to this statement 'with the proviso that the overall movement limit and noise quota was not increased'.

The Chairman noted these points made by the Members.

21. Peter Viggers suggested in view of what had been discussed in relation to sleep deprivation, that the Department for Transport issued Stage 2 of Night Flying Restrictions as soon as possible.

David Gray said, at the risk of repetition, the point of Stage 1 of the consultation exercise was to seek additional information which would inform further consideration before Stage 2. This was to ensure that the policy development was evidence based as far as possible and he would have thought this would be welcomed by the Committee.

The allegation was not accepted that the Department for Transport were proceeding with the fatally flawed proposals because they were lacking in substance and evidence. The information on economic benefits was being sought in order that they can then inform proposals which will be brought forward within a subsequent stage.

22. The Chairman asked if the Members wished to hold a meeting of a smaller group to discuss the paper or were they content for the broad comments made to be relayed to the Department for Transport.

The Members responded that their own authorities would be making individual representations.

The Chairman acknowledged that the Members represented different authorities, but the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee was created under statutory provisions and there was an opportunity for the Committee views to be put forward. However, at this stage of the proposals it was ascertained from the Members that there was insufficient interest to hold a further meeting or discussion.

The Members agreed.

2852 BAA CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME FOR HEATHROW 2004

1. ***Presentation by Paul Fairbairn, BAA Development Strategy Director (enclosed).***
A general overview of Introduction and Heathrow Development Strategy from the Capital Investment Programme had been circulated to the Members.
2. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 414**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

3. Paul Fairbairn complimented the report by the Technical Adviser which summarised the key issues from the Capital Investment Programme 2004. and through the presentation added further understanding to this.

It was made clear that at this stage the Capital Investment Programme excluded any issues associated with White Paper expenditure. The Capital Investment Programme 2005 will be the first version that will include these issues.

It was also emphasised that this was the first year that reflected the new capital planning process within BAA, including the grouping of projects in what was known as the Q5 period, which will be after the opening of Terminal 5, into a number of strategic programmes.

All the figures quoted were in 2004 constant prices.

It was also the first time that the document had been published on the BAA Extranet. Some Members may have access to this already and for those Members who wish to have access, this could be arranged by contacting Tabitha Stebbings via the Secretariat.

BAA's and Heathrow's Strategic Investment Goals were set out, which were dedicated to maximising the use of the existing runways in segregated mode and BAA aimed to do that by:

- Meeting BAA safety, security and sustainability objectives;
- Protecting current income by maintaining current asset base which was a responsible and progressive programme of investment in the existing assets that BAA hold in order to protect the income looking through to the future;
- Achieving full segregation to DfT commitments;
- Meeting key airline and alliance aspirations cost effectively;
- Accommodating A380 cost effectively;
- Protecting future income by enhancing service quality;
- Ensuring Heathrow can function as a 5 terminal airport;

Strategic Priorities for the remainder of Q4, the period leading up to the opening of T5:

- Complete existing works in progress (post D);
- Targeted asset replacements + progressive 'Clean Working & Friendly' (CWF) investments;
- MSCP programme which protects income and fits future need;

- Segregation to schedule;
- Key alliance/airline enabling developments;
- A380 Phase 1 programme;
- T5 Airport Integration
 - Protect for T5-CTA Connections;

Strategic Priorities for T5:

- Maintaining asset base + CWF;
- T5-T1 Transfer Baggage System;
- Post-T5 airline moves;
- Eastern Apron + T1/T2/T4 reconfigurations;
- Refurbishment of terminals;
- A380 Phase II programme;
- Sustainability (Surface Access/Air Quality);

CIP 2004 Totals (2204 constant prices)

	<u>Remaining Q4</u> £m	<u>Q5</u> £m
Total (non T5)	1053.3	1644.4
Terminal 5	<u>2713.0</u>	<u>286.0</u>
Total	3766.3	1930.4

The Capital Investment Programme contained a huge range of material. Three focused areas include:-

- Sustainability
- Occupancy
- Connections

Sustainability:

- Continued funding allowance for NIGS and Vortex programmes
- Surface Access – Heathrow Connect
- Identification of Pre-Conditioned Air implementation programme
- Initiation of CO2 Strategy programme

Occupancy Strategy:

- BA T5 (Single Terminal Occupancy – 2008)
- STAR T1/East Apron
- OneWorld T3
- Skyteam T4
- Non-Aligned Best utilisation of capacity across T1-T4

Connectivity Principles:

- Heathrow’s position as International hub
- Transfers integral part of Heathrow’s business
- Significant underlying volume with co-location occupancy
-“volume” dependent on circumstances
- Aligning bag “experience” with passenger ‘experience; is the priority
- Baggage system link will deliver greater predictability and consistency of performance

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

4. The Chairman thanked Paul Fairbairn for the presentation and said that for a number of years Iain Hope had taken a particular interest in the Capital Investment Programme on behalf of the Committee and asked him to speak first on the subject.
5. Firstly, Iain Hope said he had read the 200 page document and particularly wished to raise the issue that had been brought out at the end relating to the question of the movement of bags and passengers from Terminal 5. He was very perturbed on behalf of the business community, that the system as illustrated in the Capital Investment Programme did not start at 2008 when

Terminal 5 opened, and believed it was essential that an automated baggage system was operational starting in 2008. The idea of transporting passengers by bus between terminals was very unsatisfactory. It was also essential that BAA put up good ideas about a track transit system. This worked extremely well in Atlanta, USA.

Secondly, he was pleased to observe that BAA were pursuing the ancillary park limit replacement systems which were under trial and hoped these were proving successful.

Lastly, Iain Hope said with regard to the occupancy issues, he liked the idea of the annotation of the various alliances in the different terminals, but what would happen over the next few years when the alliance membership changed as it was not believed that the current alliances will be the same ones in two or three years time.

6. Mrs. Kong responded that she wished to make it clear that BAA had been through a round of discussion with the airlines and out of that came the Ten Year Capital Plan and associated with that Plan came the formula for the charges that the airlines pay BAA. The totals year by year were not negotiable. They can neither be increased or decreased.

Mrs. Kong said if she wished to implement her own ideas within the totals, this would have to be done with the permission of the airlines. The priorities were very closely monitored by BAA from a strategic point of view. A point to be borne in mind, particularly in relation to the baggage connection, it was not technically possible to put a connection through from Terminal 5 to the Central Terminal Area before Terminal 5 opened, for the simple reason that BAA do not own the land.

Mrs. Kong thanked Iain Hope for his input.

7. Cllr. Bennett asked what capacity of passengers the A380 would hold.

Paul Fairbairn responded that this would very much depend on the individual airlines as to how the aeroplanes would be fitted out. The number of Airbus quota for standard 380 configuration was 555 passengers, but the indications BAA have gleaned through the public domain was most of the carriers would operate with less passenger numbers.

8. The Chairman commented that for the first year, the Capital Investment Programme was not published as a hard copy document, but only available by electronic form, but requested for future years, perhaps a summary of the strategy behind it could be distributed and would be a useful publication.

9. Cllr. Maxwell referred to the forecasts for 2012/13 where the programme was supporting an annual passenger movement of 85.0 million. The question was asked if the forecast included mixed-mode operations at Heathrow and could an estimate be given of what the level of passenger movement might be by 2012/13 if the 480,000 cap was removed.

The Chairman said BAA would investigate this and a reply would be reported back to Cllr. Maxwell at a later stage.

10. Cllr. Beer referred to a previously discussed topic and asked if it had yet been actively considered

to undertake to provide a taxi rank outside of the Metropolitan area on the southern or western perimeter of the airport. A relatively small sum of money would be required to set this up this provision. Would there be a slot in the funding to accommodate such a scheme?

The Chairman responded that the Taxi Working Group was still meeting to discuss various issues on the subject of taxis.

Brian Yates added this scheme had been suggested to BAA by the Taxi Working Group members and it was found there could be operational difficulties. However, until a further meeting of the Group was held there was no progress on this matter to report.

11. Cllr. Cox asked how much would be spent on the improvement of air quality in the vicinity?.

Mrs. Kong replied that this had not been outlined as such in this way. There was a lot of money for public transport, and pre-conditioned air. This did not include monies for the work that would need to be undertaken towards meeting the questions raised by the White Paper.

2853 GUIDANCE ON THE PREPARATION OF AIRPORT MASTER PLANS

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 409**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

2854 BAA HEATHROW WATER QUALITY STRATEGY 2003-2008

1. Questions put forward by Surrey CC were responded to by Jon Phillips, BAA Director of Communications.

1. (a) Had all the targets scheduled to be achieved by 31st March 2004 been met?
(b) If not, which targets had not yet been met, what is the current state of progress and what is the current timescale for completion.
2. Concerns had been raised that Bedfont Lake was too small to deal with the surface run-off, and that the area of Princes' Lake (Southern Balancing reservoir) still had three times the permitted levels of silt. Could BAA assure the local community that these concerns had been/or will be addressed.

Jon Phillips responded to:-

1. (a) BAA had scored themselves in the recently published Sustainability Report (subsequent to the questions being drafted) for the achievements against strategies. On the Water Quality Strategy a score of 9 ½ out of 10 was achieved and verified by the external auditors.

10/10 would have been achieved, but for a slightly less than perfect outcome on the way improvements had been tackled to a sweeper tip on the airfield, where 7/10 was achieved, this brought the overall score to 9 1/2 out of 10.

- 1 (b) As mentioned above, except for the sweeper tip issue, BAA were fully on track.

2. BAA do not use Bedfont Lake at all. Princes Lake is used and BAA were happy with the progress made. This was de-silted last year, very successfully, and there was no need for concern in the way that water run-off was being treated in that area and discharge controls were being met.

Cllr. Maxwell thanked BAA for the response.

2855 THE CAP ON MOVEMENTS AT HEATHROW AIRPORT

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 411**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

2856 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

- 1.(a) Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 21st July 2004 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted and approved.

In the absence of the PSSC Chairman, Philip Carlisle, John Gurney stated that there had been a lack of information from BAA since February 2004, in relation to non-receipt of Quality Service Monitors e.g. the finer details of the availability of ground power and piers.

This information was essential in order to correlate and understand, together with the return of passenger and jetty data received.

Mrs. Kong said this matter would be followed up.

(b) **CLOSURE OF TERMINAL 4 UNDERGROUND STATION**

Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 412**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

2. Cllr. Khursheed asked if the General Manager of the Piccadilly Line was present at the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting on the morning of the 22nd September 2004.

Brian Yates responded that a comprehensive presentation was given to the members of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee by Peter May, Planner for London Underground and Mike Bull, General Manager of T3 Underground Station.

It was acknowledged that whilst the passengers would be unhappy with the 20-month closure, the Members were satisfied that London Underground were doing all that was necessary during the period for the passengers.

There would be no change in the number and frequency of the trains that would be travelling to Heathrow and back again. To serve Terminal 4, a shuttle bus would be operational every five minutes and if this was required to operate more frequently, plans would be put in place to do so.

John Gurney commented that the original plan of transferring disabled passengers by taxi from Hounslow West station had been abandoned, due to the cost incurred.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

2857 THE HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 410**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. David Gray informed there was a further Government response that had been made to the latest Committee report and was due to be published imminently. It was believed this would address further outstanding points raised.

2858 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report Figures for Quarter 2, (April- June 2004) and LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for (April-June 2004) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. John Stewart queried that there were a number of boroughs further away from Heathrow that reported noise complaints to HACAN/Clearskies and yet they were not included in the statistics, e.g. Wandsworth, Lambeth, Southwark and other North London boroughs.

Jon Phillips replied that if the report submitted did not include statistics from those boroughs, it was because BAA did not receive them.

If the Committee wished to request data from other boroughs, that they may be collecting, this could be added to the tabled version issued to the HACC.

3. Cllr. Jacks had observed there was a significant decline, year on year, in the number of complaints, compared to the same period last year. Was this a genuine decline?

John Gurney responded that it could be observed that when consultation papers were published, this heightened the residents' awareness and interest in the subject.

2859 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for July, August and September 2004 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

2860 NEWS RELEASES

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

BRITISH AIRWAYS PRESS RELEASE

2. 'British Airways Says Sorry' – apology to customers flying in and out of London Heathrow who had been disrupted due to delays and cancellations in August had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

AIRPORTS AND AIR QUALITY – GREENER BY DESIGN – ROYAL AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY SEMINAR – 19th OCTOBER 2004

3. At the request of BATA, the Provisional Programme for this Conference on 19th October 2004 had been circulated with the Agenda as it might be of interest to the Members of the Committee. Roger Wiltshire confirmed that Lord Whitty, a Junior Minister at DEFRA had agreed to speak at this important event.

2861 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

DATE OF NEXT MEETING - MONDAY 29th NOVEMBER 2004 (SEMINAR)

DATES OF 2005 MEETINGS:

WEDNESDAY 26th JANUARY 2005
WEDNESDAY 30th MARCH 2005
WEDNESDAY 25th MAY 2005
WEDNESDAY 27th JULY 2005
WEDNESDAY 28th SEPTEMBER 2005
WEDNESDAY 7th DECEMBER 2005 (SEMINAR)