

SURFACE ACCESS SUB-COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Surface Access Sub-Committee held on Friday 5th March 2004 in the Conference Room at the Visitor Centre

PRESENT

Members:

Sam Jones	Chairman
Maurice Hudson	Technical Adviser
Carole Havercroft	Secretary
Cllr Peter Roberts	Bucks CC
Cllr. Digby Jacks	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Rodney Bennett	LB Richmond-upon Thames
Cllr. Mewa Mann	Slough BC
Cllr. James Maxwell	Surrey CC
Cllr. Malcolm Beer	LB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Don Lyons-Davis	LAANC
Peter Viggers	EANAG
Paul Ellis	IATA
Tony Lucking	AUC
John Gurney	TUC
Roy Featherstone	ABTA
Andy Hull	Independent

BAA Heathrow

Gerard Silverstone	Public Affairs Manager - Consultation
--------------------	---------------------------------------

Others

George Burnett	Chairman, Airtrack Forum
Phil Lightowler	Bus & Coach Strategy Manager (BAA)
Jenny May	Department for Transport

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Gill Kirk (BAA), Steve Cumber (BAA), Cllr. Christopher Knight (Runnymede BC), Cllr. David Bishop (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Gerry Ceaser (Spelthorne BC), Cllr. Sydney Kallar (ALG), Roger Wiltshire (BATA), Iain Hope (HASG), Keith Harlow (Independent), Brian Yates (Consumers' Association), Paul Reardon (DfT).

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting held on 29th September 2003 were agreed as an accurate record with the following amendments:-

- 8.2 Cllr. Bennett pointed out that John Gurney had been marked down both present and absent on the attendance listing. He had in fact sent apologies as he was on annual leave.

- 8.3 The Chairman introduced Jenny May from the Aviation and Environmental Division of the Department for Transport, deputising for Paul Reardon.

The Chairman announced that he had been advised that Paul Reardon would be moving to another appointment in his career (date yet to be determined) and the Committee would be losing his services at Heathrow, which was sad news for the members as he had been a valued participant, both interesting and a good friend. His successor will be David Gray.

3. “CONNECTIVITY AT HEATHROW AIRPORT”

A presentation by Phil Lightowler, Bus & Coach Strategy Manager - Planning - BAA (*enclosed*).

- 3.1 A background was given on the Heathrow Landside Connectivity project

It was a condition of the Terminal 5 consent to consult on Interchanges, which led to the inception of the project. A workshop was held facilitated by Steve Norris in June 2002 to extract industry views on what sort of services would be needed and where they would go and how the whole operation at the airport would work. As a result of this, the views of the operators were collated and the initial connectivity proposals were presented to the HAL Executive on

14th May 2003. Feedback showed good strategic thinking, and a full feasibility study was undertaken and concluded in December 2003.

Connectivity was needed ‘to provide seamless connection around Heathrow for travellers, employees and visitors’.

Linking all parts of the airport was important and also with the transport interchanges.

The surrounding issues:-

- 8 Catering for the needs of a five terminal airport
- 9 T4 safeguarding
- 10 Air Quality
- 11 British Airways (STO)
- 12 ‘Delighting the traveller’
- 13 Operational readiness
- 14 Enable Heathrow to exploit its potential as a regional interchange fully in line with SEERA RTS (hub and spoke)
- 15 Cater for London Underground closure in 2005 in relation to the Piccadilly Line extension construction
- 16 Exploit further development at Heathrow
- 17 Fiscal gain

At present for the ‘traveller’ wishing to get around the airport the perspective is:-

- 8 Airport connectivity can only be described as 'ad hoc
- 9 There are no clear bus products connecting the key interchanges at LHR
- 10 Onus on foreign visitors to find the relevant bus service and expectation that they know where you are to get off
- 11 The vehicle may have no provision for luggage
- 12 The driver takes no account of your needs
- 13 You have to find where to wait
- 14 The waiting environment may not be friendly

At present for the 'airport worker' wishing to travel around the airport the perspective is:-

- 8 Not all major centres of activity are well served
- 9 You are expected to know what bus you are looking for
- 10 You may need to use two buses to get where you want to go
- 11 When you wait for the bus, how do you know which one is about to go first

The concept of the 'Airport Connectivity' is to provide-

- 8 High quality landside connectivity brand
- 9 Bus based product
- 10 Two continuous loops of the airport - clockwise/anti-clockwise operating 24 hours per day, seven days per week
- 11 Utilising high quality articulated buses
- 12 A bespoke interior with three doors for rapid boarding/alighting
- 5 DDA compliance
- 8 Buses with low emissions technology, potentially CNG engines
- 9 Frequency of loops to be staggered at key points to provide very high frequency connectivity
- 10 Intuitive way-finding
- 11 Excellent customer service for air passengers and to our business partners
- 12 On-vehicle information, for those who do not know Heathrow - no need to worry about being at your stop
- 13 Serving all key centres of activity

There is potential to tap into the following funding sources for the project:-

- 8 Transport Fund
- 9 Free Travel
- 10 First Route
- 11 British Airways (H30 and BA1)
- 12 First Group
- 13 Terminal 5 Construction
- 14 LUL loop closure (Jan 2005) circa. £1.1m per annum
- 15 Other opportunities i.e. Retail Advertising

The current imperatives are:-

- 8 Financial impacts
- 9 Meeting customer needs
- 10 Air Quality

Preparing for future challenges:-

- 8 Safeguarding T4
- 9 T5 public transport requirements

Consultation on the proposal was undertaken with:-

- 8 Transport for London
- 9 British Airways
- 10 London Underground
- 6 Other Operators
 - National Express
 - Oxford Express
 - First Route
 - London United
 - Tellings Golden-Miller

- 8 In terms of BAA
 - T4
 - T5
 - Retail
 - Finance
 - Ground Operations

The Case for Connectivity study looked at:-

- 8 The 'baseline' situation now
- 9 Impending challenges
- 10 Can Connectivity rise to the challenge? – opportunities, costs and impacts
- 11 Our recommendations

The Baseline study looked at the current issues:-

- 8 Meeting current travel needs – what are we trying to achieve?
- 9 Complexity of current service provision
- 10 Costs/inefficiencies
- 11 Impacts on the user
- 12 Impacts on the network
- 13 Our recommendations

A diagram was shown of the current Heathrow landside bus movements which Connectivity would potentially be able to address, together with

the current public and dedicated bus services in the Heathrow area by route, some being car park shuttles and airport shuttles and there is duplication in some of the services, i.e. 3 or 4 services that go along the Bath Road.

Therefore current issues to address:-

- 8 Duplication and inefficiencies in service provision
- 9 User uncertainty - 'need for more information/signage' ranked high on public transport user survey
- 10 BAA reliance on third parties
- 11 Quality of buses
- 12 Traffic and environmental impacts

Future challenges:-

- 8 H30
- 9 Bus operating costs
- 10 T4 – LUL replacement
- 11 Air quality targets
- 12 T5
 - Operational readiness
 - Extending local bus services
 - Meeting the requirements of regional coach services
 - Inter-terminal movements
 - Serving car parks – staff and passenger
 - Avoiding customer confusion

Connectivity Opportunities and Impacts

Options:-

- 8 Single Route
- 9 Twin Route
- 10 Three Route

But, in practice, a flexible system that can adapt to evolving demand

Diagrams were shown for all three routes via Waterside, for pre and post Terminal 5 opening.

A table was shown of assessment of the route options measured against criteria and how it meets the needs of specific user groups, i.e. local bus users around Heathrow, staff/air passengers inter-terminal, BAA staff, BA staff, T5 construction workers, T4 LUL replacement service workers, World Business Centre etc.

Each option was assessed on a high level framework against the needs of these people.

A diagram was shown of requirement of service both pre-T5 and estimated post-T5 and the service would develop on demand of need.

Summary of Options

Pre-T5

Single Route Option – Limited Demand Impact
Three Route Option – Major Infrastructure Required
Twin Route Option – Best Demand/Demand Infrastructure Balance

Post-T5

Three route option as part of a wider Heathrow Bus Strategy:-

- 8 Hatton Cross
- 9 Hubs
- 10 Transport for London services

Wider Impacts

- 8 Air Quality – up to 70% reduction in Nox and PM emissions relative to many current buses
- 9 Traffic Impacts – provides basis for significant overall reduction in bus numbers to CTA
- 10 Clear ‘brand’ to reduce user uncertainty – increasing customer confidence
- 11 Safeguarding access to T4 – short and longer term Major Infrastructure required

In reality, the new vehicle would be one to stand out from all the rest and instantly recognisable as being operated by a 21st Century airport.

The new Connectivity service would not be operated by BAA, but contracted out, but the contract given out to any operator would have a number of conditions that had to be met. Quality of service would be paramount and there would be no excuses. ‘Missing’ vehicles would not be accepted due to problems associated with unreliable drivers. There would be a strict contract in place, which the company would be held to.

As regards the operation of the service, the timetables would be staggered, with an average wait time of 2-3 minutes.

The Connectivity proposal was put to the BAA Executive Chairman. Janis Kong for approval who supported this scheme.

BAA’s Managing Director, Mick Temple had now reviewed the proposal and given the go-ahead for the project

The BAA Retail Director, Trevor Perera, had now formed a Project Board with key stakeholders at Heathrow and a project would be established to move Connectivity forward.

Two key points:-

- BAA still had consultation issues both with Transport for London, British Airways and bus & coach operators.
- The aim is to bring Connectivity in by Spring 2005 or earlier if possible.

On implementing the free Connectivity service, the Heathrow free travel scheme would be withdrawn, effectively the Connectivity service would replace not only the free travel scheme, but any other free shuttle services to avoid duplication.

In relation to the CTA, the service would go to the terminals, but not to the Central Bus Station. There would be no ticket required for the step-on, step-off service.

Following on from the presentation, the members asked questions.

- 3.2 The Chairman referred to the H30 service which will cease in April 2004 and asked who subsidised the operation.

Paul Ellis replied that in recent times, it had been split between British Airways and BAA. As discussed, the service would be withdrawn in April 2004.

The BA1 would effectively operate the same route for BAA staff, but not for the general public and eventually that service itself would be replaced by the Connectivity scheme.

- 8.2 John Gurney stated that as a result of the withdrawal of the H30, the workers in the Cargo Village area would be left with a very poor alternative service, compounded by the loss of the Underground service during closure. He was of the opinion that the H30 should have continued until such time as the new Connectivity system was in place. There was a continued demand for the service. By withdrawing this, it would force workers to return to cars and other means of transport, and would eventually prove difficult to re-train people to return to use of the bus.

Phil Lightowler responded that effectively there would still be six bus route alternatives travelling to Terminal 4 and then onward to Hatton Cross. It was understood that the British Airways shuttle bus would call in at the Cargo Village to provide the linkage to Waterside.

In terms of getting around the airport, there may be a slight difference in frequency, but the linkages would still be in place to the Cargo Village i.e. the H23 service has four buses per hour, the 805 every half an hour. If necessary, the scheduling of the timetables of these remaining services would be revisited to receive a more frequent service. However, six buses per hour on free travel was still a good service. The H23 runs from 5.15 a.m. until

11.00 p.m. and the 805 from 5.00 a.m. until 10.30 p.m. therefore from early morning to late evening, there was a service available.

The Chairman requested that the Passenger Services Sub-Committee receive a regular update on the cessation of the H30 service and the progress of the Connectivity project as it developed. This was agreed.

- 3.4 Cllr. Beer referred to one of the schematic maps shown with activity in Longford High Street which was believed to be an access route and not available to through traffic. Would an articulated vehicle not have problems travelling through such a narrow, densely used section of the system.

Phil Lightowler said that the bus route for Longford entitled any bus to use this route, including the Connectivity vehicle.

- 3.5 Andy Hull asked if the Connectivity vehicle would replace the long-term car parking buses.

Phil Lightowler said no, this would not be the case.

- 3.6 Cllr. Maxwell asked if it was possible to extend the service to Staines to in line with the popular 555/556/557 routes and would the Connectivity vehicle be fitted with transformers.

Phil Lightowler replied that all vehicles would be fitted with transformers as a matter of course. In terms of extension of service, once the Connectivity service is operational and settled in, it would be reviewed at phased stages over the course of 3-4 years, by talks with the various alternative route operators to look at the opportunities available.

- 3.7 John Gurney asked if the Connectivity service would cover both loops when it was introduced in Spring 2005.

Phil Lightowler confirmed it would include twin loops and 22 vehicles would be required to serve the route. Each bus would be capable of uplifting 140 people and weighed four tonnes more than current vehicles. Hatton Cross in particular, as a pick-up point, would require as much capacity as possible.

The service was designed for both airport staff and passengers to enjoy the same travel 'experience', being of high quality and easy to use.

It was proposed to advertise the prestigious contract for tender in the 'European Journal'. The operator chosen to serve Heathrow would have a good track record and will have to maintain a very high standard of service and their reputation nationally would be at stake if they failed to deliver this and it would be a very serious matter.

- 3.8 Jenny May asked, in relation to air quality, what steps had been taken to introduce new technology and reduce emissions.

Phil Lightowler responded that it would not be new technology. Hybrid buses were popular in the United States and were being considered.

BAA were currently in liaison with a number of organisations in the USA and working closely with Mercedes-Benz, together with vehicle manufacturers of advanced technology. An assessment would then be undertaken to seek the best power train for emissions trading.

- 3.9 The Technical Adviser referred to the BAA Capital Investment Programme for Heathrow, published two years ago, where a proposal was shown of the early stages of an automated ‘people mover’ going around the airport to link various parts, which was dropped on the instruction of the Civil Aviation Authority due to the question of funding. Would the Connectivity scheme mean that there would be no further proposals progressed for an automated ‘people mover’ for the foreseeable future.

Phil Lightowler responded that there were still plans under review on automated systems. Whether they would be used to provide connectivity of the type discussed was questionable.

The Connectivity service was a bus-based system. As it was further developed, it may continue in this way or evolve into a dedicated electric tram system.

The Chairman thanked Phil Lightowler for his detailed presentation.

4. “AIRTRACK”

A presentation by George Burnett, Chairman of the Airtrack Forum of the study into the proposed scheme which was undertaken for the Forum by consultants, W.S. Atkins (*enclosed*).

The Chairman introduced George Burnett, who is also a senior officer of Surrey County Council and he has worked closely on the Airtrack Scheme for some considerable time.

- 4.1 An outline of Airtrack, its Business Case and Study Findings was explained from the inception.

The Airtrack Forum was founded in 2000 and initially opened to all organisations with an interest in the scheme.

The concept was proposed by British Airways and chaired by Surrey County Council.

The Steering Group determined the work programme and consisted of those organisations prepared to contribute to costs.

Current Steering Group membership comprised:-

- 8 Surrey & Hampshire County Councils
- 9 Runnymede and Woking Borough Councils
- 10 Bracknell Forest Council

- 11 SWELTRAC
- 12 British Airways
- 13 SEEDA and SEERA
- 14 Highways Agency
- 15 Transport for London

The purpose of the OBC Study:-

- To test whether an AirTrack type scheme could have a sound business case
- 8 To re-check likely engineering costs in the light of developments since 1998
 - 9 To re-check likely usage
- To match the scheme to changed transport objectives
- 10 To consider environmental impacts
 - 11 To consider funding mechanisms
- To influence key stakeholders
- 12 To guide the Airtrack Forum on future strategy
 - 13 NOT intended to provide detailed engineering designs

Objectives:-

- 8 To meet policy objectives by improving public transport links to airports and facilitating orbital travel in the region
- 9 To make better use of rail network capacity by improved integration with other services at key interchange hubs
- 10 To provide relief to congested local and regional road network
- 11 To contribute significantly to sustainable growth of the South East economy
- 12 To increase public transport's share of surface access journeys to Heathrow and contribute to BAA targets
- 13 To provide access to developing regional transport hub at Heathrow
- 14 To introduce network of new sustainable rail services

A map of the rail network showing the base case of the Airtrack services that it was envisaged the consultants would be asked to look at was shown, fundamentally, Terminal 5 – Reading via Staines and Bracknell; Terminal 5 to Guildford via Staines and Woking and Terminal 5 to Waterloo via Staines and Richmond.

Background:-

- 8 Direct rail link an aspiration since 1950s/1960s
- 9 Feltham Railair Link
- 10 SWOPTIONS
- 11 SWELTRAC
- 12 The Western Connection
- 13 London Airports Surface Access Study (LASAS)

14 AirTrack

The Options:-

Four main options for a scheme were considered:-

SWELTRAC proposals

- expensive
- minimum environmental impact
- routeing not designed for T5

M25 Route

- originally identified in 1996 LASAS study
- parallel to M25 from Staines Moor to Chertsey
- bridges over Thames and M3 – high capital cost
- only connection to Guildford branch – not Reading
- hence study tested shorter version to Egham linking Guildford and Reading routes

Staines Moor and reversing at Staines Station

- recommended by Halcrow study of 1998/1999
- identified operational difficulties at Staines Station

Staines Moor and Staines Chord

- scheme selected

Maps of rail links and access to Heathrow were shown together with panoramic view of Staines and Staines Moor.

Staines Moor and Staines Chord

Five main infrastructure elements to the Airtrack Scheme

- 8 Staines Chord linking existing Windsor and Virginia Water lines in Staines town centre
- 9 New station at Staines High Street
- 10 New junction on Windsor Line at Staines Moor
- 11 New alignment across Staines Moor and Stanwell Moor
 - southern section on old embankment used by passenger services until 1965
 - then alongside (widened) M25 to J15
 - under A3113 Airport Way
- 8 New station facilities at Heathrow Terminal 5 with access to platforms 3 and 4.

Capital and Operating Costs:-

Construction costs = £205.3 million

8 Total annual operating costs = £25.15 million

It was forecast that demand for total Airtrack boardings in 2011 at the a.m. peak period would be 14,460, with 5,610 trips to and from Heathrow.

The Detailed Base Case Scheme

- 8 Three services (Waterloo, Reading, Guildford) each with headway of 30 minutes
- 9 Running time from Terminal 5 of 33 minutes to Waterloo and Guildford with 38 minutes to Reading
- 10 Operating hours 05.00 – 24.00
- 11 Trains formed by two (four car) units on each line
- 12 Rolling stock suitable for operation in tunnels to/from Terminal 5
- 13 Premium fare of £2 to/from Terminal 5

Sensitivity Tests

- 8 Increase frequency for Waterloo service to 4 per hour
- 9 Cross link with Heathrow Express services
- 10 Remove fare premium
- 11 Raise fare premium to £5.00
- 12 Adjust stopping patterns
- 13 Reverse at Staines Station with no Staines Chord
- 14 M25 Route
- 15 Road User Charging at Heathrow
- 16 Area Wide Road User Charging
- 17 Vary length of trains to 1 unit for Reading & Guildford services
- 18 Withdraw Rail/Air Coach Services
- 19 Boarding Penalty doubled to 7 minutes
- 20 Replace existing services with Airtrack

Procurement and Funding

- 8 Procurement likely to be via TOC and ROSCO existing framework
- 9 Use of incumbent TOC as supplier favoured
- 10 Most likely route for capital works procurement would be a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), which is likely to be either Design Build Finance Transfer (DBFT) or Design Build Finance Maintain (DBFM)
- 11 Anticipation from Price WaterHouseCooper that much of the capital cost can be raised from the private sector, but funding likely to be necessary from the Strategic Rail Authority for project development

Appraisal (1)

The Appraisal was based on the Appraisal Summary Table (AST), using the latest Guidelines issues by the Strategic Rail Authority and was one of the first schemes to go through, which combined the appraisal elements for the full range of New Approach to Appraisal (NATA) criteria –points noted in the economic appraisal were:-

- 8 Scheme would allow better interchange between modes, thus opening up routes not previously available for workforce or leisure users

- 9 Direct access improved from areas adjacent to Heathrow, especially Staines, which have suffered from the negative aspects of proximity without capitalising on location advantages
- 10 Would provide effective alternative to car based access to Heathrow and would improve workforce mobility
- 11 Would result in small reduction in traffic levels in surrounding areas
- 12 Would generate further employment and reduce negative perceptions of businesses to accessibility of Heathrow

Appraisal (2)

The Environmental Assessment covered seven headings:-

- 8 **Noise and Vibration** – may be impacts associated with increased rail traffic on Staines to Windsor line, mitigation measures need to be considered in further development
- 9 **Air Quality and Global Atmospheric Emissions** – not likely to be any consequences for local air quality in the context of public exposure and compliance with objectives
- 10 **Land & Water Pollution** – proposed Airtrack routeing would need careful design to avoid major impacts from landfill sites.
- 11 **Landscape & Townscape** – subject to high quality design and attention to detail. Staines Chord could be integrated into local streetscape, but some residual adverse visual impact. Would affect Staines Moor SSS1 to a greater or lesser extent, but primarily in the short-term.
- 12 **Biodiversity** – any problems most likely to occur at Staines Moor SSS1, which would need careful application of best practices.
- 13 **Cultural Heritage** – areas of archaeological interest have been identified, which will probably require detailed/investigation.

Conclusions and Next Steps

- 14 Despite a cautious approach, the Airtrack OBC appeared to be robust and compared well with other new rail schemes.
- 15 Would attract over 15 million passengers per annum.
- 16 Would reduce number of cars on the roads during a.m. peak time by 5,000.
- 17 Would enhance access to Heathrow with much of southern England within one rail interchange.

- 8 Present Outline Business Case for formal submission to Strategic Rail Authority.
- 9 Ensure that key stakeholders are fully informed of results e.g. Ministers, Department for Transport. BAA. Network Rail, Southwest Trains.
- 10 Airtrack Forum offer to work with the Strategic Rail Authority on further technical appraisal.
- 11 Possible establishment of local working group in the Spelthorne area to consider implications of scheme implementation as they have reservations on the scheme from an environmental aspect.
- 12 Examine potential funding opportunities/sources.
- 13 Creation of appropriate SPV (SRA/BAA).

- 14 Prepare Transport & Works Act assessment.
- 15 Detailed design.
- 16 Consultants estimate that operation could commence in Winter 2011.

Following on from the presentation, the members asked questions.

- 4.2 Cllr. Bennett referred to three pedestrian level crossings in place between Waterloo and Richmond and Barnes and Richmond and more trains would be travelling through with the implementation of Airtrack.

George Burnett agreed that there would be an extra four trains per hour on that particular line but there was potential to improve the situation and minimise the impact.

- 8.2 Cllr. Roberts referred to the closure of the line and asked had the old Staines station not been re-developed during the past few years and additional land sold-off to property developers, would that funding otherwise been available towards the scheme.

George Burnett did not believe this would have made any difference.

- 8.3 Cllr. Maxwell referred to the Staines Chord and stated that Spelthorne BC (and he wished to record that he spoke on their behalf as they had no representation at the meeting) had reservations on the environmental impact the scheme would cause on the embankment at the station and feared that it would attract more private motor cars travelling into the centre of Staines and as a consequence create further congestion by people wishing to use the station.

George Burnett replied that clearly the parking situation could prove a potential problem, but this could be worked around. However, it was not proposed that the station itself would have any dedicated parking area, but an off-parking scheme for the local boroughs would be considered for the Town Centre at Staines.

The Staines Chord was only a short stretch of railway line and needed lateral thinking.

The scheme was very attractive as there would be six trains per hour from Staines to Heathrow as opposed to the current service of two trains per hour.

- 8.4 Paul Ellis asked George Burnett if the Airtrack Forum wished HACC to lobby any action by means of support for the scheme.

George Burnett replied that the Airtrack Forum had received co-operation and technical support from BAA, who as a major player were in approval of the scheme. Any further support from the Committee would be welcomed.

All facts and figures presented in the study were based upon known planning proposals.

- 8.5 Cllr. Jacks proposed that the Committee endorsed the Airtrack scheme in principle and make appropriate representations to the Department for Transport.

The Chairman replied that the recommendation would be put forward at the next main HACC meeting on 31st March 2004 to the members for approval. It was understood that the only main objector might be Spelthorne BC as they were not entirely happy overall with the proposal of the scheme, at which time they could confirm.

Cllr. Maxwell supported this suggestion on behalf of Spelthorne BC.

Cllr. Maxwell stated that it was a recommendation of the Terminal 5 Inquiry that some form of transportation scheme be implemented. He agreed that the Committee should recommend the scheme from a transportation perspective.

- 4.7 Cllr. Bennett referred to Crossrail and the impact this would have on the scheme and the space allocated.

George Burnett said this would depend if Crossrail were taken up as an objective. Transport for London had been in consultation on the Airtrack proposal and had cross-referenced the two schemes. Capacity would need to be improved as part of the overall service.

- 4.8 Cllr. Beer confirmed that his constituency of Windsor & Maidenhead was very supportive of the scheme, as it would also help areas such as Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale, which at present were overlooked from a transport perspective. Cllr. Beer added he would be making favourable representations for LB Windsor & Maidenhead to participate on the Steering Group.

- 4.9 Peter Viggers confirmed in agreement with other members that the Airtrack scheme be supported.

- 8.2 Jenny May asked what the timetable would be for submission of the proposal.

George Burnett replied that the Airtrack scheme proposal was due to be submitted to the Strategic Rail Authority later in March. At the same time it would be submitted to various controls at the Department for Transport.

The Chairman thanked George Burnett for his detailed presentation and confirmed that the Committee endorsed the Airtrack scheme in principle, particularly as it was a requirement of the Terminal 5 consent.

Mr. Burnett thanked the Committee for the opportunity to present the detailing of the proposals for Airtrack and support commended for the scheme by the members.

5. “TAXIS AT HEATHROW AIRPORT”

Update by the Technical Adviser on the Civil Aviation Authority and Public Interest Finding against BAA Heathrow.

‘Notice to all London Hackney Carriage Taxi Drivers and Organisations that represent the Drivers’ issued by BAA, together with representations sent to the CAA on behalf of the Committee had been circulated with the Agenda and noted. A Taxi Information leaflet issued by the taxi drivers’ was tabled.

- 5.1 Roy Featherstone commented that the deliberations arising from the BAA Taxi Working Group meetings were not progressing quickly enough and there had been no visible improvements in recommendations made as yet. It had been hoped that the issues raised of importance that needed to be addressed would have been finalised within one month from the outset, but this had not been the case.
- 5.2 The Technical Adviser confirmed that the Civil Aviation Authority had extended the consultation period for a further three months regarding the public interest issue finding against BAA and the HALT levy as a result of representations from a taxi drivers’ organisation.

The next Taxi Working Group meeting would be held on 25th March 2004, where the proofs of new designs for the revised taxi posters and leaflets produced by BAA would be examined. This would give the opportunity to take forward that which had been discussed when those present at the last meeting found a certain amount of acceptance from BAA to the idea that an integrated Onward Travel Desk would be preferable to a Taxi Information Desk.

The Technical Adviser had attended a Business Travel Exhibition at Olympia and spoke with a large taxi company exhibiting, who had expressed an interest to offer a contract with BAA, Heathrow for an onward travel advisory service.

In addition, the Technical Adviser had spoken with the relevant person at BAA’s Corporate Office responsible for drawing up the HALT contract for BAA and advised that the Committee would expect to be consulted on the terms of this contract before it was entered into with the taxi drivers at Heathrow to give an opportunity to the HACC to support any new arrangements.

6. “EXTENSION OF THE CENTRAL LONDON CONGESTION CHARGING SCHEME TO KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA”

Update by the Technical Adviser on the new consultation entered into by Transport for London.

Mayor Livingstone has proposed to extend the congestion -charging scheme to cover most of Kensington, Chelsea and Westminster.

A report will be distributed on this subject with the main HACC Agenda for the meeting on 31st March 2004. A copy of the summary leaflet will be annexed to the report for discussion.

7. “CROSSRAIL”

Update by the Technical Adviser on position regarding Government support.

7.1 It was confirmed there was no further news or advancement on the scheme since the last meeting. It was hoped that Crossrail would be in a position to update the Committee at the main HACC meeting on 31st March 2004, following the Government’s commissioning of a report by a gentleman called Montague, to study the feasibility and economics of Crossrail. The report was delivered to the Secretary of State on 10th February 2004, but as yet Crossrail were unable to further comment.

7.2 Tony Lucking stated that he attended a meeting at the London Chamber of Commerce where Tony McNulty, Minister for Transport was present, when he was asked how much private businesses would have to contribute to Crossrail.

His response was £10 billion; in other words, the full cost of the project.

He went on to say, that it would not be funded in the traditional public way. Tony Lucking believed this would also apply to other rail projects in the future.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8.1 John Gurney stated that he had received correspondence from Transport for London with reference to the Piccadilly Line. He confirmed that the Terminal 4 closure would now also incorporate the refurbishment project and would therefore not be closed again at a later stage as originally planned. They were also looking to a stair-lift facility to assist disabled passengers and would confirm the decision shortly.

8.2 There were no further matters to discuss and the Chairman closed the meeting at 4.30 p.m.