

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of meeting held on 25th May 2005 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Margaret Majumdar	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. Jafar Khaled	-	LB Hammersmith & Fulham
Cllr. Digby Jacks	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Ajmer Dhillon	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Mike Cox	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. David Bishop	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Jim Maddan	-	LB Wandsworth
Cllr. Rodney Bennett	-	LB Richmond upon Thames
Cllr. Malcolm Beer	-	RB of Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Christopher Knight	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Peter Roberts	-	Bucks CC
Cllr. Julia Long	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Gerry Ceaser	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Martine Hyams (Deputy)	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Malcolm Beer	-	RB of Windsor & Maidenhead
Philip Carlisle	-	GTMC
Roy Featherstone	-	ABTA
Peter Viggers	-	EANAG
John Gurney	-	TUC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Donald Gregory	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent.
Janet Brady	-	Independent

OTHERS:

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

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Janis Kong	-	BAA Executive Chairman
Mick Temple	-	Managing Director
Ben Morton	-	Interim Director of Communications

PREENTERS:

- Simon Talbot - BAA Commercial Transport Manager
- Vernon Murphy - BAA – Heathrow Rail
- Mike Noakes - BAA – Heathrow Rail
- Paul Collins - University of Cambridge

APOLOGIES:

1. Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

Tabitha Stebbings (BAA), Mike Forster (BAA), Brian Yates, (Consumers' Association), Cllr. Mike Cartwright (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Danny Brown (Independent).

1. Before the proceedings of the meeting commenced, the Chairman announced that:
 - (a) James Maxwell was no longer a representative of Surrey County Council and therefore had automatically stepped down as a long-standing Member of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

The Chairman asked the Secretary to send a letter to James Maxwell on behalf of the Committee thanking him for his valuable contribution over the years. This was agreed.

- (b) The Chairman advised that those Members who knew Pieter Betlem who sat on the Passenger Services Sub-Committee would be sorry to learn that he had unfortunately suffered a heart attack. At this stage, no information was known as to the severity of his condition.
- (c) Tony Lucking who had represented the AUC for a number of years, had also stepped down from the Committee. His successor was yet to be notified to the Secretary.
- (d) The Chairman made the Members aware that Rachel Webb was sitting in the Public Gallery to observe the proceedings of HACC and welcomed her. Rachel was a member of Stewkley Parish Council and the Bucks Association of Local Councils.

2912 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 16th March 2005 were agreed with the following amendments:-

1. Virginia Godfrey referred to Minute 2900, second paragraph of (3) on page 14.

‘The question was asked by minimising noise, did this mean that actual noise would be reduced or did it mean some sort of an increase, but not as much as the global traffic, but similar to the noise limitation, and when would Parliamentary time permit’.

It was requested that this be corrected to read ‘ *or did it mean some sort of noise but not as much as the traffic increase and when would Parliamentary time permit*’.

2. David Gray referred to Minute 2900, (7) on page 15.
He made a small point, in that it was not quite correct to say that he had suggested that the Consultative Committee should seek formal representation, but had indicated that it had always been open for them to do so.
3. Following on from this, Cllr. Ceaser stated that it had been agreed that the Committee would try and seek representation.

The Chairman said this was correct.

2913 MATTERS ARISING

1. **Minute 2898 – Transport for London – Late Running of the Underground at Weekends**
Copies of representation made by the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee and BAA News Release – Mayor warned new London Underground scheduling could affect Heathrow had been circulated with the Agenda and noted.

The Chairman said that both the Committee and BAA seemed to be at one on this matter.

2. Cllr. Bennett wished to place on record that the LB Richmond upon Thames as a full Council, formally opposed the proposal by Transport for London.
3. The Chairman gave feedback on matters arising from the meeting held on 16th March 2005.
 - (a) **BAA to come back to the Committee with a presentation on the Central Bus Station**
This presentation took place during the course of the meeting (*see Agenda Item 6*).

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

2914 “ THE SILENT AIRCRAFT INITIATIVE”

1. A presentation by Paul Collins, Project Manager for the University of Cambridge/ Massachusetts Institute of Technology led research work on development of a silent aircraft was made to the Members.*(enclosed)*.

The “Silent Aircraft Initiative” was launched in November 2003 to run to the end of September 2006. It was a joint project between the University of Cambridge and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Funding of £2.3 million had been provided from the Cambridge-MIT Institute. It was a credible concept design of ultra-low noise aircraft. The research team consisted of 35 people in 5 disciplines.
The long-term goal of the initiative was implementation in 20-25 years time.

How Ambitious is the Silent Aircraft Initiative?

- “Silent” = Inaudible above the background noise outside an urban airport
- Perception of noise is subjective
- Noise comprises level, frequency, content, tonal characteristics, sudden onset, duration, number of disturbance.....
- 10 dB reduction is *perceived* to be “half as loud“, but is *actually* 1/10th as loud

- So what would the advances pursued by the Silent Aircraft sound like relative to today’s aircraft. (*A demonstration of noise effects was played to the Members*).

- New operations procedure can reduce current noise levels
- Conventional “tube and wings” design would not meet SA1 objectives
- New aircraft allows optimisation of aircraft design AND operations

Current and Future Partnerships

- DTI, DfT, NEMA, BAA, Heathrow, Gatwick, Luton, British Airways, Lochard, NASA, Rolls Royce, B and K, Boeing, ESDU, easyJet, CAA, NLR, DHL, Marshall Aerospace, HACAN/Clearskies, NATS. Cranfield, EEDA. EMRA, EMDA, BATA, Scottish Enterprise, 4 local authorities, Luton Borough Council, Eurocontrol, LMS, My Travel Airways, UPS, Bombardier Shorts, Britannia, Messier Dowty, GKN, Greener by Design, SBAC, RAeS, Virgin.

Designing for Low Noise

- **Minimise Drag**
 - Drag => turbulence =>.noise
 - Airframe is as noisy on approach as the engines
 - Plane has to dissipate 8 MW on approach – how if drag is low?

- **Minimise take-off weight**
 - High weight => high thrust =.high .noise

- **Minimise jet velocity**
 - Big jet area, low velocity for quiet thrust on take-off
 - High by-pas ratio => low noise
 - High-drag nacelle => low cruise efficiency

Silent Aircraft Concept Design

- Blended wing-body airframe
- Embedded propulsion system
- Variable cycle propulsion
- Silent drag
- Quiet high lift capability
- Low-noise undercarriage system
- 4000mm, 250 pax

Delta Planform Permits Embedded Engines

- Delta planform is an efficient all-lifting surface
 - Speed-unstable regime requires active control system
- Embedded Engines reduce noise
 - Air intakes create extra loading on the engines
- Needs quiet high-lift devices to meet noise goal
 - New slat design, for example
- Perforated drag rudders produce lower noise levels
 - Need to be many times larger than conventional design
- Conventional undercarriage too noisy, even when deployed late, inside airport boundary
 - New design needed

CDA Reduces Noise and Pollution

- Benefits from “Continuous Descent Approach” (CDA)
- “Basic” CDA’s in use at various airports, including Heathrow
- “Advanced” RNAV CDA’s now feasible

Trade-Off Noise and Operational Flexibility

- Constrained airspace
- Pilot/controller workload and acceptance
- Repeatability with different winds, aircraft dynamics, FMS logics, pilots
- Must ensure continued safe operation at busy airports

Trade-Away Messages

- In the next 20 years, Silent Aircraft technologies could enable noise reductions that match those made in the last 40 years
- Operational changes could bring valuable benefit in next 5 years with existing aircraft
- Silent Aircraft technologies could be used in medium term on existing fleet
- Economic impacts to UK and its regions could be huge

Mr. Collins ended the presentation by thanking the Committee for the opportunity to present and said that if any Member had a wish to follow up on any of the points covered in further detail, he would be happy to liaise with them. Brochures and flyers illustrating the “Silent Aircraft Initiative” were circulated with his contact details.

2 Following on from this report, Members asked questions/responded.

- 2.1 Andy Hull asked if the theory would still work on a scaled-up design of that plane.

Paul Collins said, yes indeed this would work. A 250-seater had been tackled as being a plane that is of commercial interest and of use to the travelling public, as being a realistic way of getting in these new concepts and achieving the very stringent goal.

The model that had been shown could be scaled up to a much larger aircraft. Obviously, if the take-off weight increased, so would the noise level. The larger aircraft would undoubtedly be noisier, but this is purely a step-change reduction in the noise element.

- 2.2 Cllr. Roberts stated that in the 1950's he worked for 12 months at the University of Cambridge with Dr. John Head who was a pioneer on the laminate flow. Checks on a slow emission engine aircraft were undertaken. There was a special built-up wing which was looked at with airflow on a low-speed aircraft on a flight. This work may have been a forerunner to some of the work being carried out now on the "Silent Aircraft Initiative" which was welcomed.

Paul Collins agreed that the team were building on work that had been going on at the department for many years. Studies on the jet engine actually took place in Cambridge. British Aerospace Systems were a Partner on this project, with a Chief Test Pilot advising on the aspects of flying and what theoretically can be done, whilst talks were underway with a commercial air pilot to find what they are actually permitted to do.

- 2.3 Virginia Godfrey said that the studies were extremely welcomed. It was marvellous work in the long-term. However, were there any medium-term incentives to encourage the airlines to put this into place.

Paul Collins said the drivers for low noise are always brought about by a Code of Practice being introduced. It is usually a commercial advantage to airlines to save fuel and anything that can be done that will make the planes fly more efficiently as well as more quietly will be adopted first. With the increasing pressure to reduce noise in its own right, it was believed that there was an incentive just from the travelling public to reduce noise.

- 2.4 Philip Carlisle asked, as this design looked like a stealth fighter would this create a radar return problem or is it owing to the special materials that it made it more or less visible to radar. The design appeared to have no windows which led to two conclusions, that either it would not be commercially attractive as far as passengers were concerned, or if it is, can it become safer and have passengers facing backwards as they would not be able to tell the difference in a 'black hole'.

Paul Collins said this was an interesting question. With regard to the radar return, the actual shape of the aircraft, although in some ways it did resemble a stealth fighter, does actually have a conventional screwed profile, so it can receive messages from any other aircraft. There was not the angular shapes that were looked to on some of the other aircraft that avoided radar reception.

An artists' impression of the aircraft was shown with windows included in the design.

The previous design shown did not have windows in. There had been a major debate with the later design as to whether windows would be available or not. It was suspected that these would be available for some of the passengers near the outer edges of the aircraft, but passengers sitting in the centre of the aircraft would be well away from windows.

Some of the cabins on the jets were so wide that if you were not at a window seat, there was precious little chance of seeing out anyway. The inside of the cabin would resemble more of a building e.g. a theatre or cinema. With the technology available for projecting views from outside onto screen, it was thought that the airlines would come up with all sorts of ingenious ways of keeping everybody happy. As a matter of interest, because it was a concept design project, that level of detail was not being looked at, but would follow much later on. The perception of the public would change over the next few years and this type of issue would then be less serious in terms of take-up.

- 3.9 Cllr. Bennett asked what impact will this have on noise in the passenger cabin. Earlier reports from France had indicated that the A380 is much less quieter.

Paul Collins replied that with regard to the interior noise, the engines were right at the back of the aircraft where there is quite a considerable space for them on this kind of design. It was believed there would be room for the necessary bulk-heads and tubing to go in, just as there will be space for duct-work leading into and out from the engines.

It was not anticipated that cabin noise would be a major issue. There were other things that needed to be considered, such as the pressurisation of the cabin. The tube was easy to pressurise whereas a flat object was much more difficult to pressurise. There were structural issues to be addressed, but confidence had been shown that these would be overcome. The standard of the new Dreamline era of the A380 had a high premium on the internal as well as the external noise. Passenger comfort was a major consideration and the aim was for quieter on the inside as well as outside.

- 2.6 Cllr. Majumdar agreed with Virginia Godfrey that it was an extremely welcomed concept and hoped that David Gray of the Department for Transport was already planning how to get the use of planes with this design into the requirement of the operation of aviation in 20-25 years time.

If it was understood correctly, for those residents who lived under the take-off routes, there was nothing to be gained until 20 years time.

Mr. Collins stated that in terms of how long it would be before the design was in service, the development cycle on everything from cars to aeroplanes was constantly shortening.

The initiative in terms on knowledge and exchange was a step in that direction, where the

ideas that are put forward as a research proposal were taken up into the marketplace much more quickly. This was another reason for embedding the project into the aircraft community, which included not only the aircraft industry, but organisations such as HACAN/Clearskies, local authorities, designers and operators of airports.

All of these had a major impact on the way the noise profile is perceived.

To say that the aircraft could reach service in 20 years, was obviously an estimate. It was thought that certain features of the design would be seen on aircraft in a shorter time-frame than this, used for freight or in-flight re-fuelling for example, to prove this kind of technology. Once the concepts had been tested and people are comfortable designing this type of aircraft, then they can be introduced for passenger use. This will be a stepped process.

Twenty years is a realistic time-scale to see this design in service, but in the immediate term, a lot of the technologies that were being developed would come into existing aircraft, either retro-fitted or actually built into variants on the existing fleets so that as aircraft are re-designed for customers, they would take advantage of the new technologies that were being developed.

- 2.7 Cllr. Jacks stated that he agreed with the other Members that it was a welcome concept. He asked what was the level of airframe commitment to the involvement from companies such as British Aerospace Systems or Rolls Royce.

Paul Collins responded that the commitment from the various manufacturers was very high. There was a lot of interest from the airframe engine manufacturers, but also the others who supply into the manufacturing sector for aircraft. There was already a great deal of expertise in the industry. By talking to a very wide community of people, the expertise can be brought into the project and make the research even more relevant to the needs and to take advantage of the virtues that currently exist.

- 2.8 Roger Wiltshire stated that as previously discussed, the A380 was designed specifically to meet the noise requirements of Heathrow Airport, which in terms of large aircraft and noise, was leading the world. Unfortunately, there was a field penalty associated with that design and it points to the fact that the airlines and the aerospace manufacturers were seeking to do both things at the same time; reduce carbon emissions and reduce noise.

It was very good that research was being undertaken between the University of University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology that would lead us to think about the future design concept, but in the meantime, manufacturers are delivering aircraft that have both reduced fuel use and noise levels, particularly in areas such as the fuselage and undercarriage which had not been looked at previously.

- 2.9 Peter Viggers asked what was to be done about the pollution from the air in aircraft engines.

Paul Collins said that this was a very important point and tied in with the statement made by Roger Wiltshire. Usually, and certainly it was the case up until now, noise attenuation systems that had been provided led to a fuel penalty, usually to increase weight.

There were all sort of ingenious devices that could be put on aircraft to make them quieter, but by carrying that load for the entire journey, even if it was only used for a few minutes on take-off and landing, clearly had a very negative environmental impact as the fuel consumption increases for a long-haul flight and therefore created an increase in the pollution.

On the “Silent Aircraft Initiative”, the noise target that had been set was being looked at to bring the technology into play in such a way that the efficiency of the aircraft can be checked as progress was made. The primary driver was still noise, but the idea is that the efficiency of the aircraft will not be impaired by the devices that were put on. One of the major factors in this aircraft, which is unique at present, is the embedded engine design which allowed the air to be sucked off the top and that has a major impact which reduced the fuel consumption considerably. This gave a margin to play with for noise attenuation.

The Chairman thanked Paul Collins for the informative presentation and gave the good wishes of the Committee to him on this interesting development project. It was hoped that a further presentation would be made to the Members in the future, when significant progress had been made.

2915 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

1. **Committee Membership** – this was covered by the Chairman prior to the commencement of the proceedings.
2. **Re-issue of ID Cards** - the Secretary had undertaken the processing of the required paperwork for the relevant Members, liaised with the ID Centre and issued the new ID Cards on the morning of 25th May 2005 at the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting.
3. **Future Heathrow** - the Chairman reported that the Members would have read in the Press of the launch of an organisation ‘Future Heathrow’. A pamphlet was passed around the table for information.

2916 “BAA CENTRAL BUS STATION RE-DEVELOPMENT PROJECT”.

1. A presentation by Simon Talbot, BAA Commercial Transport Manager was made to the Members.*(enclosed)*.

Working in partnership, BAA and National Express have agreed a new commercial agreement that will:

- Increase the coach capacity of the Central Bus Station
- Introduce new information, ticketing, retail and catering facilities
- Formalise the role of National Express in managing the Central Bus Station operation
- Provide a major step change in the customer experience

Service Monitoring had been carried out in Summer 2004, the scores from which revealed that customers had told BAA that the Central Bus Station offered some of the poorest facilities that were measured at Heathrow. These were bench-marked against other programmed facilities e.g. cleanliness and catering, but the results of the reports showed that BAA were not hitting the targets they should be setting themselves and something had to be done to remedy the situation.

National Express had worked out that just to maintain their modal share over the next five years with existing passenger growth, that the current Central Bus Station would

not be suitable to grow their business. They shared the concerns of BAA over customer service and the facilities being offered which were poor and not managed proactively. There were also issues on overcrowding, quality of catering, ticket and information offering.

The Heathrow Central Bus Station is the second largest coach station in the UK and coach passenger numbers need to grow as Heathrow grows. Improving the customer offering is a clear business aim going forward. Doing nothing until the Central Area of Heathrow is developed (may be 2012) was not feasible.

It has been agreed that BAA and National Express will jointly invest £2.5 million in enhancing the capacity and facilities of the Central Bus Station.

BAA are to release management of the CBS formally to National Express until the end of 2010. National Express will invest in resources to enhance the customer experience by improving safety, information and ticketing provision and provide baggage handlers on the coach bays.

BAA are to retain ownership of the asset, setting departure charges, retail and catering management and health and safety governance.

National Express are to manage stand allocation, ticketing, customer service provision, monitor cleaning, health and safety management.

The new Central Bus Station development will provide:-

- 2 new coach bays
- Roofed and enclosed concourse waiting area with 184 seats
- New ticket office with 5 serving counters
- New information point located on the concourse
- Real Time Information display screens for coaches
- New Coffee Shop/catering outlet – replacing Little Chef
- W.H.Smith relocates and doubles in size
- New Information Point located close to the subway lift entrance

The build timescale was tight with the completed facility anticipated to be up and running by Christmas 2005. Obviously whilst this building is underway, disruption will occur.

National Express staff will be on site during this process to ensure the safe wayfinding of passengers.

2. Cllr. Khursheed referred to the extra seating capacity and asked if CCTV will be in operation and what manned security will be available.

Simon Talbot replied that there will be CCTV in the new Central Bus Station. There will also be staff on site 24 hours per day. The CCTV will be operated by central security.

Cllr. Khursheed stated that it had been indicated that the seating arrangement would comprise of 180 seats, with staff on site 24 hours per day, linked to security arrangements. The due problem at the airport were people staying over of 'no fixed

address' for the night and leaving in the morning.. Would sleeping facilities be provided.

Simon Talbot said this was a separate issue. This was a matter that BAA were aware of and would manage.

Cllr. Khursheed said that the two original lifts currently in operation were always breaking down causing problems for passengers. Was it intended to spend part of the £2.5 million on upgrading the lift facility.

Simon Talbot replied that the interiors, the reliability, quality of the lifts and the cars themselves were not part of this project.

3. Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey asked what provision had been made in the agreements to preserve standards and how would this be controlled through safeguards, if the standards fell below a certain level.

Simon Talbot replied that this depended on what type of standards were in question. If it was customer service, the Service Quality Rebates (SQR) and Quality Service Monitors (QSM) will be used to monitor this and a customer survey. With regard to health and safety standards, BAA retain governance of the area and will be both monitoring and auditing to ensure that the precise health and safety procedures are in place. Safety inspections of processes will be carried out on a monthly basis, as with any other concessionaire.

4. Cllr. Jacks said he believed he was correct to say that the new Central Bus Station would result in an increase in the usage of buses for access to Heathrow. The question was asked, what is the projection for increased passenger numbers using the new facility.

Simon Talbot said that National Express need a capacity increase of around 30% to maintain their modal share. Currently, 8 million passengers pass through the CBS annually for National Express and the local bus site. An additional 30% to this figure would mean an approximate 150,000 extra people.

5. Cllr. Beer stated that some communities do not have proper bus services into Heathrow and had to drop off people who wish to use the CBS facility by car. The current drop-off facility is very dangerous and under-provided. The question was asked if this would be enhanced in the future and if not, this was a bad omission.

Simon Talbot said it was not in the scheme for this plan. The number of passengers arriving by cars, was particularly low. If this matter changed it would need to be addressed.

6. Cllr. Khaled asked if buses would run on a 24-hour operation.

Simon Talbot replied that there were a variety of buses that ran on a 24-hour operation.

7. Paul Ellis said that he very much welcomed the improvement of the CBS facilities. However, it was not clear to the extent which this included the local bus services. It appeared that this upgrade was directed exclusively at the coach services which it had been indicated accounted for 450,000 people out of the 8 million passengers.

The question was asked if the other 7.5 million people were going to be included in using this facility or was there a separate plan for improving their use of the Central Bus Station.

Simon Talbot replied that National Express will provide information provision for both local buses and coaches. Facilities at the Central Bus Station need to be available for all.

The nature of the local bus business is that the dwell-time is much shorter and therefore the benefit of the new services would go to the coach passengers more.

Negotiations had been undertaken with Transport for London to see what information they would like included. They had said they also wished to install new TfL bus stops and infrastructure. This has been fed back to the airport panel and they will certainly not be ignored.

8. Paul Ellis asked if 'real-time' information would be available for local bus users to be able to stay in the comfort area of the new Central Bus Station and then go to the relevant bus stops.

Simon Talbot replied that unfortunately 'real-time' information cannot be provided for Transport for London users. It had been suggested that with the half-hourly night services there needed to be public address announcements in the vicinity which allowed people to wait in comfort.

9. Keith Harlow asked if the building work would cause significant disruption to the existing bus and coach services.

Simon Talbot replied that it would not cause any disruption to the bus and coach services, as the traffic layout would not be altered or the carriageways. It may at times, inconvenience passengers who may wish to access those services, but only in that they will have safe routes through the construction areas. The provision of information would be given by dedicated staff in various locations, so there should be plenty of people on hand to guide the passenger during this time.

The Chairman thanked Simon Talbot for the informative presentation and wished BAA well with the remainder of the project, due for completion by the end of 2005.

2917 "BAA FORECASTS STRONG 10-YEAR TRAFFIC GROWTH FOR LONDON AIRPORTS"

1. Report by Technical Adviser (**HACC 425**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Peter Viggers referred to paragraph 5. He stated that at the time of the T5 Inquiry, it had been reported that the Terminal itself could take up to a volume of 30 million passengers per annum. He understood it was now proposed to open the Terminal for a full capacity. It was also hinted that the capacity of the Terminal as it is, could in fact be anything up to 40 million passengers per annum. It was therefore suggested that the figures quoted in paragraph 5 were somewhat on the low side, as it was thought that given the full

capacity of Terminal 5, plus the current passenger movements at Heathrow, a figure in excess of 100-110 million passengers travelling through the airport per annum would be reached, when Terminal 5 was completed.

It was added that at the T5 Inquiry, IATA had estimated that demand would be 121 million passengers per annum. It was suspected that this estimation had probably now increased in the mean time. BAA were therefore probably four-fifths of the way to containing, or hopefully to provide, services for the un-restrained demand.

Mrs. Kong replied as Members were aware, there was a link between capacity and demand. A figure of 30 million passengers per annum had been estimated as BAA were working to a phased relocation on Terminal 5. On completion of Phase 1, this would enable British Airways to move all of its operations to Terminal 5 and release space in the existing airport. It would not be until 2008-2011 that the second phase would come through with the second satellite in place. The BAA view on what this does to increase and cope with the demand is laid out in the paper.

2918 “GATWICK AIRPORT OUTLINE MASTER PLAN”

1. Report by Technical Adviser (**HACC 424**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman reported that the Heathrow Draft Interim Master Plan was not yet ready for consultation and discussion. This would be mentioned by Mrs. Kong in her Commentary. It was intended to hold a Special Meeting of the HACC devoted to the Heathrow Draft Interim Master Plan.

(Secretary’s Note): The Special HACC Meeting has now been scheduled for Friday 22nd July 2005 to debate the contents of the Draft Interim Master Plan. This would take the form of a Seminar with BAA presentations, possibly involving the LB Hillingdon’s planning department.

3. The Technical Adviser stated that he had attended a meeting of the Gatwick Consultative Committee arranged by BAA Gatwick and the local planning authority, to talk about their Draft Master Plan. The document concentrated on developing the airport as a single runway airport because of the uncertainty about whether or not there would be a second runway at Gatwick which would only occur if there were no third runway at Heathrow. BAA had entered into a Planning Agreement that they would not attempt to construct a runway before 2019.

The Plan actually showed the location of a second runway, should it happen and the amount of land-take required, with a breakdown of the different land changes in that area. Associated with that, as at Heathrow, there are proposals that the CAA are preparing for providing compensation for noise and blight. This was not yet ready for Gatwick for several weeks yet. It would be some time after the publication of their Draft Master Plan.

The Technical Adviser referred to paragraph 8 of his report. It stated that it was accepted that 280,000 flights could be handled slightly earlier than 2015 and that forecasted passenger throughput will be a few million short of the maximum by 2015. This is the date after which any runway at Heathrow would be built, should this happen.

The Technical Adviser referred to paragraph 11 of his report. This outlined the A380 which was a matter of some concern to Members of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee. Gatwick is developing itself on the basis that it expected to be able to handle the A380, but not in any quantity. It was likely, at least in the initial years to be available as a diversion airport for Heathrow, should the weather be inclement or some other incident precluded them from landing at Heathrow.

4. Cllr. Bennett referred to the suggested withdrawal of the Gatwick Express and the very serious outcome of this action.

The Technical Adviser responded that it was a serious proposal. The Strategic Rail Authority had been in negotiation with a number of organisations. BAA Gatwick had been running a campaign entitled 'Murder on the Gatwick Express' to oppose the proposals of the Strategic Rail Authority.

As some Members would be aware, the Strategic Rail Authority itself would be wound up in the not too distant future when the rail department of the Department for Transport will take over these responsibilities. At present, there had been no suggestion that they have a view about this. The situation remained with the proposals that the SRA had put forward. More capacity out of the tracks was proposed by travelling through Gatwick and down to the South Coast, by ending the exclusivity of the Gatwick Express primarily for airport passengers and to merge the services.

One suggestion made was a devoted coach for airport passengers appended to trains which would run on down to the South Coast. Attached to that, some of the services would be curtailed, so that instead of running down through Gatwick, Haywards Heath, Eastbourne and Hastings, all the trains would terminate at Eastbourne. Some of these would run from Brighton, but would then carry commuters with a much greater seating capacity available, particularly in peak-hours. The problem arose when the trains that travelled from Victoria to Gatwick had to cross over the tracks between the town of Horley, which is quite close and Gatwick Airport itself, which reduced the number of trains that actually ran through there. There were suggestions that some different platforms at Gatwick could be used, but the platforms are so narrow, this was not safe to do this.

The Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee had strongly opposed the proposals and were campaigning for the station to be re-built.

5. Cllr. Bennett asked if this meant that the trains would take a longer time to reach their destination.

The Technical Adviser said that purpose-stops would be introduced and the train would not run non-stop Victoria-Gatwick. The Strategic Rail Authority had not mentioned train journey times. However, this must have been built into their proposals.

6. Before the next Agenda Item, the Chairman raised two points:-

1. The Chairman said that in future, it was intended to give regular updates on air quality.
to the Members.

2. Certain Members of the Committee had experienced great difficulty parking their cars upon arrival for the HACC meeting. It was thought that this was mainly due to the plane spotters parking in the Visitor Centre.

Mrs. Kong said that Gill Kirk would take this action away to ensure that in future, special arrangements were made on the day of the HACC meeting for car parking for the Members.

2919 COMMENTARY FROM THE EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN, BAA HEATHROW

1. The BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been circulated and was noted.
2. Mrs. Kong referred to the recently published BAA end-of-year results. At Heathrow, where over a £1 billion were invested in the last financial year, profits rose by 11% and passenger traffic was up by 5.3%. BAA owed a big thank you to all the staff, communities, passengers and airlines who made this possible.

The Members were aware that BAA had a great deal of work ahead of them over the next few years.

3. **Terminal 5** – was progressing well and the landscape continues to develop. The external facades in both concourses A and B are now underway, with the multi-storey car park and the slip road ramps now visible.
4. **Expansion of Terminal 1's International Departure Lounge** – On the immediate horizon, a 20,000 sq. ft. extension to the International Departure Lounge at Terminal 1 was soon to be opened. This will create more space for retail and catering outlets, which will make a difference to the passengers. It was suggested that a visit be arranged at some stage for the Committee Members.
5. **Terminal 3** – the addition of an extension to Terminal 3's Arrivals Lounge will also be visible, together with the development of the new Pier 6 which is progressing well in preparation for the arrival of the A380. Additional stands at T4 will also be in place.

All of this takes BAA towards the opening of Terminal 5 in 2008. After that, space would be available in the existing terminals as airlines moved across to T5. BAA would seek to provide a mirror image of the Terminal 5 apron and a refit of the existing terminals would be carried out which would reflect the commitment BAA had to transforming Heathrow.

6. **Interim Master Plan** – the Government's White Paper required BAA to publish a Master Plan outlining Heathrow's future. The Draft Interim Master Plan would be published in June, which will provide details of plans up to 2015 and an outline for 2016-2030. Amongst other details included within this Draft Interim Master Plan, it would show an indicative boundary where any third runway development would be.

This document would go out to consultation until 31st October 2005.

Basically there were three parts to the Draft Interim Master Plan.

The first part is what is known today on the plan within the existing boundary.

The second part is the proposed new runway and boundary as published in the Government's White Paper.

The third part is the proposed terminal complex and boundary as published in the BAA response to the White Paper, entitled 'Responsible Growth'.

Mrs. Kong gave an assurance that there was nothing new in the Draft Interim Master Plan that was not already in the public domain or that had not previously been discussed with the Committee Members.

For the first time, the Interim Master Plan will bring everything together.

Mrs. Kong had discussed this matter with the Chairman who had suggested that a Special Meeting of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee be held to debate the contents of the Draft Interim Master Plan.

Currently relative to the Heathrow Interim Master Plan were the BAA voluntary schemes to protect the local communities from current airport Noise and property Blight arising from the White Paper's proposals. Following the consultations, it was hoped that BAA would be ready to publish the details of the four schemes by the end of June 2005.

7. **Health & Safety Executive Awards** – Terminal 5 were presented with five Awards. 'Worker of the Year'; 'Best Occupational Health Initiative'; 'Best Site Facilities Found'; 'Best Commitment to Health & Safety'; 'Health & Safety Organisation of the Year'.
- 7.1 Following on from this report, Members asked questions/responded.
- 7.2 Peter Viggers wished to refer to an article in the 'Financial Times' dated 25th May 2005. headlined 'Air Traffic Alarm Over Tight, Tough Price Control Proposals'. This was an item where the CAA were in fact telling NATS that they cannot increase their prices to the same extent that they wanted to and therefore there may be a deterioration in the services that NATS can provide.

It was not certain if it was fair to ask BAA for a detailed consideration on this point but that it was a worthy subject to flag up and that as a Committee, this should be re-addressed in due course.
- 7.3 Cllr. Khursheed said that he was sure that BAA were aware of the need to transform Heathrow Airport, but were they aware of the problems they are causing by merging certain flights within all four terminals, particularly the British Airways flights. It was causing difficulty for arriving passengers. Previously, it was easier to direct passengers for local and European flights to Terminal 1. Now, directions had to be given to all the terminals for different flights. Coupled with the closure of the Terminal 4 Underground Station this was a causing a lot of problems for the passengers.

The question was asked if there were any short-term plans to address this matter, although it was appreciated that with the opening of Terminal 5, it was likely that this situation would change.

Mrs. Kong said that the problems reported related to information and not about service. BAA were aware of the problems which were challenging. The system previously in place was a very nice, easy picture e.g. Terminal 1 for short-haul flights, Terminal 2 for European flights, Terminal 4 for long-haul flights. The day that BAA started to shift the short-haul and long-haul mix between Terminal 1 and Terminal 4 had caused problems. The situation was likely to get worse in the short-term and this meant that BAA had to get even 'more clever' in the way that information was communicated to the passengers.

- 7.4 Paul Ellis said that as picked up in the discussion, in 2008 BAA will start to get some resolution and there will be an occupancy strategy for the Heathrow terminals which will aim to rationalise and that the alliances will seek to be relocated e.g. British Airways will be in Terminal 5 and Terminal 3, STAR Alliance in Terminal 1 and Sky Team in Terminal 4. People will get used to thinking in terms of the alliance routing. It will be a significant change as it does mean the bringing together of various combinations of long-haul and short-haul services, which is different from that in the past, but it is the new future practice that is being worked towards.
- 7.5 Cllr. Margaret Majumdar asked if at some point, the Committee Members could receive a list of which airline is with which alliance, which would be helpful. This was agreed.
- 7.6 Cllr. Beer referred to the meeting held in Central London on 23rd May 2005, to promote the launch of the new aviation lobby group 'Future Heathrow'. The question was asked if the Members of the Committee would be receiving feedback of the events of the Group as obviously their proceedings would involve HACC.

The Chairman stated that Paul Ellis was the Chairman of the organisation 'Future Heathrow'.

Iain Hope explained that he represented the London Chamber of Commerce and that body was one of the founder partners of 'Future Heathrow'. They had been consistent on behalf of their 3,500 members for many, many years. The membership was made up of private, small, immediate size businesses. On behalf of the members, the London Chamber of Commerce had campaigned over many years for the need for good, adequate air services for exporters and the business community which is vital for local and national requirement. That is why the London Chamber of Commerce are founder partners of this venture and working also for some sustainable recovery.

- 3.9 Mrs. Kong stated that BAA were not actually a member of this group, but that did not mean that they were belittled in any way. The group would be used in conjunction with important stakeholders for consultation.

- 7.8 Cllr. Roberts asked that bearing in mind that a third runway will be very much closer to South Buckinghamshire than the current movements are, will consideration be given by BAA to recompense communities for the noise sustained, as currently applies to the local London Boroughs.

Mrs. Kong replied that she would not say yes to this. It would seem that if the runway does come to pass in the event of the very, very heavy environmental conditions being met, there was a piece of dialogue that would be communicated, not just with the immediate local authorities, but with all the local authorities and communities. However, what the result of that discussion would be, could not be determined.

- 7.9 Cllr. Bennett referred to 'Go-Arounds' and asked why the number of these changed from month to month and what was the reason for these.

Nita Easey responded that this figure would vary from month to month. If viewed across the whole year from previous reports, the figures were more or less the same. There was no specific reason for any change. It was usually 0.20 to 0.26 on the total number of arrivals. There was nothing dramatic in this. It was just what was happening at the time. A 'Go-Around' took place when for one reason or another, the aircraft is due to land and is prevented from doing so. This may be because an aircraft has been slow leaving the runway, it may be that birds had been noted in the area and it would be unsafe to land or a runway problem. There could be a range of reasons why a 'Go-Around' had proved necessary.

Mrs. Kong added that 'Go-Arounds' were perfectly safe procedures and in fact at an efficiently operating airport, the number of 'Go-Arounds' as reported in her Commentary would be expected.

- 7.10 Cllr. Jacks referred to the de-commissioning of Runway 23 (Crosswind Runway) and asked how the space will be utilised.

Mrs. Kong replied that the runway had not been used for several years and had actually already been out of service and therefore BAA were only formalising this fact. It was difficult to state its future purpose. It can only be used without the other runways as it was a cross-wind runway. The aircraft type in operation today, do not have the sensitivities as they used to have. Reference was made to the taxi-ways to the east on the 'toast-rack- effect, and now BAA can go away from this for the first time ever and get back to proper rectangular taxi-ways which were much more efficient.

- 7.11 John Gurney referred to the sale of the Cargo Village and asked if this money would be re-invested into Heathrow.

Mrs. Kong replied yes, every penny and profits made to the tune of £2 billion, would go into re-investment at Heathrow.

- 7.12 John Gurney referred to the Press articles on Air Accidents Investigation Branch (AAIB) reports on the number of ground accidents at Heathrow and the concerns expressed that BAA needed to do something about them.

Mick Temple responded that the situation was not as conclusive nor as dramatic as the report in the Press.

2920 “HEATHROW CONNECT SERVICE”

1. A presentation by Vernon Murphy, BAA Rail of the stopping service to be introduced between Heathrow Airport and Paddington Station was made to the Members (*enclosed*).
2. It was anticipated that subject to final safety clearance it will start on 12th June 2005.

The story so far.....

- **1987 – Government commissioned the Heathrow Surface Access Study**
- Concluded that a main line rail link from Paddington was the best option and could be profitable
- **1991 – Heathrow Express Railways Act**
- The power to construct Heathrow Express was granted in the Heathrow Express Railways Act
- **1996 – St. Pancras to Heathrow Airport**
- BAA announced its ambition to run a second Heathrow Express service to St. Pancras
- **1998 – Heathrow Express launched**
- Carried over 27 million passengers such launch. Now clearly established itself as the first choice for passengers seeking the fastest way between the airport and Central London.
- **T5 Inquiry – Surface Access Proposals**
- Heathrow ‘North’ to link into Thames Valley commuter services
- **1999 – Hayes and Ealing**
- Thames Trains and other services which call at Hayes would be linked to Heathrow by a ‘Hayes Shuttle’
- **2005 – Heathrow Connect**
- Run as a joint partnership between Heathrow Express and First Group, the successful winner of the Thames Train 2004-2006 franchise. Part of BAA’s long-term strategy to improve surface access to the airport, the service is anticipated to take up to 5 years to fully develop.

Heathrow Connect Twin Investment.....

- £35 million investment package on new rolling stock and infrastructure enhancements
- Trains - £23.5 million order for 4 Siemens Desiro EMU
- Infrastructure - £11.5 million investment in Depot development

Heathrow Connect The Service.....

- 2 trains an hour
Paddington: **:08 and **:38
Heathrow Airport Terminal 1, 2 and 3: **:06 and **:36 .
- First Train – Last Train - Weekdays
Paddington – 04:42 – 23:08
Heathrow Airport Terminal 1, 2 and 3: 05:36 – 00:06
- 25 minute journey time
- Driven by Heathrow Express employees
- 2 on-board attendant per service throughout the journey
- Train operations controlled by the Heathrow Express Control Room – liaising with First Group as and when required

Depot Development.....

- 3 additional sidings
- 1 new head-shunt
- Controlled emission toilet facilities extended to each road
- Upgraded bespoke depot control facility to manage all movements
- Double tiered accommodation – new training rooms, stores, facilities and office space

The Benefits.....

Improved connectivity to the world's busiest airport for:

- 4,000 locally based airport staff
- Over 108,000 local jobs depend upon the airport
- 4 million commuters in the Thames Valley through Hayes interchange
- Links to Reading, Bristol and Oxford through Great Western network

- Additional connection to the London Underground network through Ealing Broadway
 - Direct links to the Central, Circle and District Lines
- New trains for commuters
 - Counter directional peak flows ensure commuters will not lose seats
- Local area regeneration through the Hayes Partnership
 - New service provides a direct link between the key worker homes that form part of the Hayes Partnership's development of the local area and the sectors most in need of employment – St. Mary's Hospital
- Local Employment
 - Employment of 30 new staff to work on the service. 47% of Heathrow Express' employees reside in the Heathrow Connect local community
- Hayes Transport Hub
 - BAA working with Transport for London, First Group, the local authority and developers to create an interchange with improved facilities and passenger environment

**BAA Rail
Developments...Terminal 5**

- Twin Tunnels from Terminal 1, 2 and 3 for both Piccadilly Line and Heavy Rail
- Station facilities at T5 with:
 - 2 platforms for Piccadilly Line
 - 2 platforms for Heathrow Express
 - 2 platforms safeguarded for additional services

**BAA Rail
The Future.....**

- **Heathrow Connect**
Additional rolling stock. Order placed with Siemens for 5 Class 360/2 Desiro EMUs, allowing the Heathrow Connect fleet to increase from its Launch operation of 4 x 4 car to a 5 x 5 car operation
- **Crossrail**
BAA welcomes the opportunity for Crossrail to serve Heathrow. BAA is now working with CLRL to achieve that outcome. The earliest Crossrail could start operating is 2014, and Heathrow Connect has been introduced to meet the needs of the airport in the interim. Should Crossrail launch into full service it will absorb Heathrow Connect.
- **Airtrack**
Continue to work with the SRA and partners as part of the long-term strategy to improve surface access to the airport.

3. Following on from this report, Members asked questions/responded.

3.1 Cllr. Khursheed stated that he was concerned that the fare structure on Heathrow Connect would not encourage airport workers from Hayes to use the service. They would continue to use the 140 bus service to go into the airport. Also, all trains

operating between Hayes and Harlington and Paddington currently accept the Freedom Pass and Zone 6 Travelcard, but it was understood these passes would not be valid on the Heathrow Connect service.

Vernon Murphy replied that all the normal tickets that can currently be used on the First Great Western line between Hayes & Harlington and Paddington will be valid as it will be a First Great Western service line. The charge from Hayes & Harlington will probably be £1.00 for airport staff. There will a season ticket rate and it will be very good value. The service is aimed at staff to encourage them to use it.

- 3.2 Iain Hope said that he used the Great Western Main Line as his local service and greatly welcomed the plan. The 25-minute transit time from Heathrow with all the stops listed seemed ambitious, particularly bearing in mind the track capacity problems in the rush hour. For Heathrow Connect will there be the same sort of priorities that the Heathrow Express currently has, or will it have to be operational on the slower lines and therefore take its turn along with everything else e.g. facing signal problems.

Vernon Murphy responded that the Heathrow Connect will use the slower lines because it had to stop at all of the stations. It fits into the timetable. Certainly using the electric track it means it had a better performance than the turbo engines. There was a 23-minute turn-around time allowed at Heathrow. The trains needed to operate punctually.

- 3.3 Cllr. Jacks said that technically and from a planning point of view, the service was excellent. Firstly, was it correct to say that from Terminal 5 to Terminal 4 there would be a shuttle service and then another shuttle service from Terminal 4 to the Central Terminal Area. If so, this arrangement appeared to be cumbersome. Secondly, was it not possible to have the whole service covered by a Travelcard arrangement integrated into the public transport system of London.

Vernon Murphy replied that as far as the Travelcard was concerned, the £6.00 add-on fare into Heathrow stands. Heathrow Connect was not being promoted as a good option from the London Underground stations in Central London. If the combination of timings were looked at with the half-hour interval service and the cost of using a rail ticket or a Heathrow Connect ticket, it was actually quicker for passengers to stay on the London Underground. The Heathrow Connect service was aimed at a specific market into which the research had been carried out.

As far as the shuttle service aspect was concerned, it was understood that once Terminal 5 opened, there will be trains from the Central Terminal Area into T5 and Terminal 4. The CTA will become an interchange for passengers who wish to change between the Heathrow Connect service or Heathrow Express or for people who wish to go from Terminal 5 to the CTA, or from T4 into the CTA inside the airport. Theoretically, the CTA will become a hub station.

- 3.4 Paul Ellis said he welcomed the introduction of the Heathrow Connect service, and particularly the initiative to encourage staff to use it. It was very important for staff to travel to work with an attractive fare structure in place. However, two trains an

hour was not an attractive proposition. From recent discussions, it was understood that there would be three trains per hour. Would three trains per hour be introduced within the next year or two.

Vernon Murphy explained that two trains per hour was all that could be negotiated with the Network Rail/Strategic Rail Authority scheduling regime. It was thought that in the longer-term there were ways of agreeing more than two trains an hour. Strategically, once the service was up, running and established, pressure can be applied to do this, although it will be necessary to increase the junction capacity. Once the Heathrow Connect service is operational, there will be between approximately one third of a mile to one mile which will have a two-way run. That is a major constraint on capacity. In the longer term, whether from Crossrail or an improved Heathrow Connect, to be able to build the second stage of the viaduct flyover at airport junction was important. It was thought that this was an issue that Mrs. Kong would put into the next Quinquennial Review as one of the Heathrow Development Plans.

- 3.5 Peter Viggers said he was pleased to note that Vernon Murphy had stated the fact which had been known for many years, in that it was not possible to put six-way tracks on the system as the land space was not available.

As regard fares, it was agreed that the cost was comparable, but it really depended on where a passenger started from in London as to whether the Piccadilly Line or the Paddington line was used, but they had to be of equal value.

Vernon Murphy responded that he agreed with the first point made. To the second point, this was interesting in that, preferably in the shorter term, it was correct, but if the Great Western Main Line Suburban trains were observed, Isombarb Kingdom Brunel did not build his railway for commuters. The Great Western Main Line is unique into London in allowing many two and three-coach trains in the rush hour which no other serious railway would permit, as they would say to the commuter service that they were wasting train power. There needed to be a longer-term move to state that the rationalisation of service is to make best use of capacity, involve everybody and was the way forward.

- 3.6 Cllr. Knight welcomed the service from the Hayes area. The only concern was for those people that drive to the airport that lived slightly on the boundaries of Hayes. They might start to drive to and around the location of the station, causing the fly-parking scenario.
- 3.7 Cllr. Beer stated that his constituents, particularly those in the Maidenhead vicinity have had enormous problems with the new train schedules from December 2004. It was hoped that the Heathrow Connect will not impinge upon their services in the future.
- 3.8 Roger Wiltshire welcomed the introduction of the Heathrow Connect Service which he hoped would be smooth. Obviously, it introduces a possible conflict for customers at both Heathrow and Paddington as between Heathrow Express and Heathrow Connect. The question was asked how the two train services will be differentiated in these two places.

Vernon Murphy said this was a key issue and BAA Rail were very conscious that one of the customers of the Heathrow Express are foreign residents. If they look at the train indicator boards for Heathrow Airport, they will take the next train and not realise the difference. Steps were being taken to try and handle this situation. At Paddington, apart from the first train in the morning, none of the Heathrow Connect trains will go from the Heathrow Express platforms, but from the far side. A physical decision will have to be made to walk to Platform 11, to catch the Heathrow Connect. Also, tickets for the Heathrow Connect service will not be sold at the Heathrow Express Ticket Office. These will be sold from the Great Western Ticket Office which is a franchise operation.

- 3.9 The Chairman thanked Vernon Murphy for the presentation. He also asked how the commencement date of the service would be announced.

Vernon Murphy replied that the final certification of approval will not be received until 30th May 2005. Official invitations are currently being despatched for the Launch Ceremony to be held on 16th June 2005. Assuming all this goes ahead, announcements on the live regional TV will be made and in the local newspapers.

- 3.10 John Gurney asked if a General Notice would be distributed to the community at Heathrow.

Mrs. Kong confirmed this would be done.

2921 “AIRCRAFT NOISE MONITORING ADVISORY COMMITTEE – MEETING ON MAY 10 2005”

Report by Technical Adviser (**HACC 423**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

2922 CONSULTATION BY THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Reducing the Climate Change Impact of Aviation

Report by Technical Adviser (**HACC 426**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

2923 PROJECT FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF HEATHROW (PSDH)

1. Update report by the Department for Transport on the work of the Technical Groups had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. David Gray stated that the Technical Adviser had been present at the meeting of the Stakeholder Surface Access Working Group on the 20th May 2005. (**Secretary’s Note**) The Minutes from this meeting are (*enclosed*).
3. David Gray said that his colleagues had arranged a meeting for 26th May 2005 with the local authorities from Slough, Spelthorne, Hounslow and Hillingdon to take them through the air quality work.
4. Virginia Godfrey said that HACAN/Clearskies were very concerned at the lack of environmental representation on the impact of the work that was being undertaken. .

There was also concern on compliance with the noise contours and what Terms of Reference the Department for Transport were instructed to look at.

David Gray replied that compliance with the noise contours in the White Paper was the requirement, but not the only one as the wider impact of noise would be looked at.

The Technical Panels were looking at air quality issues before a decision was made. The Environment Agency and DEFRA were represented on the appointed Panel. Discussions had been undertaken with environmental groups, but they were not formally represented on the Panel.

5. Cllr. Majumdar referred to the section on Mixed-Mode/Noise of the Progress Report and asked if the Cranford Agreement and Runway Alternation are kept, how can Mixed-Mode operate.

David Gray responded that it was too early in the work of Mixed-Mode to give details as to whether there are ways in which it would be possible to operate. More information would be relayed at a future HACC meeting. As Members were aware, in any event, the White Paper holds the Government to the long-standing commitment made at the time of the T5 Inquiry on runway alternation. This will be part of the work that will be carried out in Spring 2006.

6. Peter Viggers asked why environmental groups should not be represented on the Department for Transport Panels.

The Chairman stated that the HACC had requested to be represented on Panels other than the Surface Access Group, the meetings of which the Technical Adviser attends, but there had been no response from the Department for Transport to this query.

The Chairman asked David Gray if there was an update to report on representation on the Panels.

David Gray responded that as discussed on a previous occasion, there is no formal live modelling group as such because at this stage integral work is ongoing to try and find different scenarios to which the Department for Transport could get stakeholder reaction.

7. Cllr. Ceaser referred to the rail aspect of surface access and asked when and where a Plan would be available.

David Gray responded that more detail would be available on this aspect in the early part of June 2005. The funding option is up for consideration at a meeting to be held on 26th May 2005 with the Strategic Rail Authority.

Cllr. Ceaser said he would await further details.

2923 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 16th March 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.

2. The Chairman asked the Chairman of the PSSC, Philip Carlisle, to inform the Committee of any issues arising from the meeting held on the morning of 25th May 2005 that would be of interest to the Committee.

Philip Carlisle reported that the Members undertake **Terminal Monitoring Exercises**. On the last inspection in April 2005, it was found that there was more cause to compliment BAA than to complain. This should be noted. The toilets and cleanliness were generally good.

The report of smokers' not liking where they smoke was a minor problem.

The Members had previously received presentations from Matt Sheridan of **H.M. Customs & Excise** on the subject of illegal meat imports. A report had been given at the meeting by her on the progress made, which was basically zero, in the sense that they had run trials on the Australian or New Zealand model in one terminal, approaching passengers with plastic waste bins, suggesting if they did not surrender everything they should not be bringing into the country, they might be prosecuted. The results in the UK were the same as those in Australia, in that it had revealed that 60% of the people who gave foodstuffs up voluntarily, did not surrender the total amount they carried.

H.M. Customs & Excise were employing consultants to help them come up with the right method and a solution to this problem. In the meantime the PSSC Members had strongly recommended that the signage, which warned passengers of what they can and cannot bring into the country should be replaced with more visible posters in the location where passengers are pre-warned more quickly before they arrive in the Baggage Hall.

The Committee had not previously been aware of the fact, but **London Underground** had announced there would be eight close-downs at weekends for engineering works on the Piccadilly Line commencing on 6th-7th August 2005 running through until Christmas 2005. The whole line will be closed from Hyde Park Corner to Acton Town. There would be provision made of a replacement coach service leaving Hyde Park Corner every four minutes to cover this stretch of the journey. Negotiations are in process for the Heathrow Express service to offer a cheaper ticket for passengers on these weekend closures and for the Heathrow Connect service to accept Zone 6 Travelcards and tickets to encourage passengers going to Heathrow Airport, to use this means of transport, to ease the pressure on the replacement road services underway.

3. Cllr. Khursheed stated that at Hounslow West Station, the train drivers had again been instructed to make the particular announcement with regard to the closure of the T4 Underground Station, during the course of the journey on the Piccadilly Line.

The question was asked if there was an update available on the Underground signage at the Help Points.

Philip Carlisle responded that as far as the announcements were concerned, it was not just the train driver announcements, it was also the announcements at the stations. In particular, the Members of the PSSC think that at Hounslow West station there ought to be an announcement by the platform staff, particularly emphasising that anybody who has a weight or health problem should actually ignore the 'get off at Hatton Cross' and carry on to Terminal 1, 2 or 3 where they can be assisted. Despite the instructions that had been re-issued, these were not being completely carried out by the staff or the Managers involved.

2924 NTK WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 23rd March 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

2925 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report and Borough Noise Line Figures for January to March 2005 (Quarter 1) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

2926 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE REPORT

1. Report from BAA Heathrow Flight Evaluation Team for the Winter period 2004 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Cllr. Beer asked if an update was available as to when the Night Flights consultation would be published.

David Gray replied that the Department for Transport believe this will be 'shortly'.

2927 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for March and April 2005 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

2928 NEWS RELEASES

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

2929 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY 27th JULY 2005

