

## HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the Meeting held on 25th July 2007 at Heathrow Point West

#### PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. David Bishop	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Felicity Barwood	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Peter de Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Martin Elengorn	-	LB Richmond on Thames
Cllr. Jim Maddan	-	LB Wandsworth
Cllr. Malcolm Beer	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Christopher Turrell	-	Bracknell Forest BC
Cllr. Patrick Roberts	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. David Rowlands	-	Bucks County Council
Cllr. Dev Dhillon	-	South Bucks District Council
Cllr. Christopher Wright	-	London Councils
Geoff Pope	-	London Assembly
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
John Gurney	-	TUC
Philip Carlisle	-	GTMC
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Susan Laurie	-	Independent
Mako Mochizuki	-	Independent

#### OTHERS:

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

#### HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Mark Bullock	-	Managing Director
Ben Morton	-	Director of Communications
Mike Forster	-	Business Strategy Director

#### PRESENTERS

Paul Ellis	-	General Manager - British Airways
James Cole	-	Director of Airport Coordination Limited

## **CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

### **Apologies for absence were received from the following:-**

1. Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos (Surrey CC), Susan Parsons (ABTA), Cllr. Cllr. Julia Long (Slough BC), Lynette Braithwaite (AUC), Cllr. Ruth Cadbury (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Shirley Fisher (LB Hounslow), Brian Yates (Consumers' Association), Colin Mitchell (Independent), Mike Walsh (Independent).

2. Following the trial of the 1.30 p.m. start time of the HACC meeting in May, the Chairman spoke on the timing of the HACC meetings going forward. He explained that one of the reasons that a 2.00 p.m. start had been established in the past, was in the event of an intervening visit between the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting and the main Committee meeting, when more than an hour was required to arrange this. The Chairman asked the Members for their preference of either a 1.30 p.m. or 2.00 p.m. starting time for future HACC meetings.

The Members requested that the start time for HACC meetings should revert to 2.00 p.m. The Chairman agreed.

3. The Chairman announced that for the September 2007 meeting, it was hoped to arrange a Terminal 5 visit, which could last for two hours. It had been considered for the July meeting, but the site was still subject to the wearing of hard hats and shoes. It would therefore be an inconvenience for the Members to become kitted out. If it was possible to arrange the visit in September without the restrictions, the HACC meeting would need to commence at 2.30 p.m. on that day.

The Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting would finish before 12 noon.

The T5 visit would take place between 12 noon – 2.00 p.m. Lunch would be held between 2.00 p.m. – 2.30 p.m. in the Atrium at Heathrow Point West.

The Chairman asked if this suggestion commended itself to the membership. This was agreed.

### **4051 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

1. (a) The Minutes of the meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2007 were agreed.

### **4052 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT**

#### **1. Committee Membership**

Following the local Elections in May 2007, letters had been received from:-

**Slough Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Julia Long, as the HACC Member and Cllr. Dexter Smith as Deputy, **London Borough of Ealing** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Ian Potts as the HACC Member and Cllr. Nigel Sumner as Deputy, **London Borough of Hounslow** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Felicity Barwood as the HACC Member and Cllr. Shirley Fisher as Deputy, **Runnymede Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Patrick Roberts as the HACC Member and the appointment of Cllr. Prof. Moreton Moore as Deputy, **Bucks County Council** confirming the appointment of Cllr. David Rowlands as the HACC Member, **South Bucks District Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Dev Dhillon as the HACC Member and the appointment of Cllr. Alan Oxhey as Deputy, **London Councils** confirming the appointment of Cllr. Christopher Wright as the HACC Member and the re-appointment of Cllr. Heidi Alexander as Deputy, **Spelthorne Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Denise Grant as the HACC Member and the appointment of Cllr. Michael Bouquet as Deputy.

Also, George Trussler has now been appointed as the main HACC Member with Cllr. Jack Pinkerton as Deputy, **RB Windsor & Maidenhead** confirming the appointment of Cllr. Philip Bicknell as the HACC Member and Cllr. Malcolm Beer as Deputy.

Following on from these appointments, the Chairman welcomed both the new Members of the Committee and some long-standing Members who had served previously on HACC.

#### **4053 MATTERS ARISING**

1. (a) **Minute 4 – Contact details for Brenda Boardman (Virginia Godfrey).**

Virginia Godfrey said that she had already followed this up with the relevant person, but would do so again, if the details had not been received.

1. (b) **Minute 4035 – Establish dialogue for Committee with BAA on issues relating to South side of the airport.**

2. John Gurney confirmed that he had a meeting set up with BAA.

1. (c) **Minute 4035 – Heathrow Area Transport Forum/Steering Group.**

2. The Chairman said that this related to another request on behalf of the Committee that they should be represented on at least the Bus & Coach Working Group.

Ben Morton confirmed that a further request had been made to Alistair Duff, the Chairman of the Heathrow Area Transport Forum/Steering Group. However, he had said that this was still a polite decline.

3. The Technical Adviser pointed out that three or four years ago, the Government required Airports to set up Transport Forums, with the idea that all the stakeholders should be represented on it.

The Forum did in fact appoint the HACC Chairman, Sam Jones, to attend the Forum meetings. However, they had not met for a very long time, and only then approximately once a year.

The Forum had a number of Working Groups, some of which the Committee would not wish to be particularly interested in. However, there was one very key group, which was the Bus & Coach Working Group, which looked at plans and put into local authority transport plans provision for services for Heathrow Airport. The Committee had been consistently denied the opportunity to attend and participate in this on the plea that HACC did not provide transport services.

If the membership of the Bus & Coach Working Group was surveyed, it would be seen that there were a number of local authorities and other organisations who did not provide transport services. In that sense, they were no different from HACC.

If the Committee were able to attend those meetings, they would be able to obtain some information which was not currently available to them.

At the meeting of the PSSC on the morning of 25<sup>th</sup> July 2007 and on other occasions, questions had been raised about services, such as those which would only serve Terminal 5 from outside London, after the terminal opened. The Committee would be much better advised about and able to contribute from the discussion, if representation could be made from the Committee at the Working Group meetings. This was an experience which was expressed by the HACC Members and yet they were still denied access to it, on what would appear to be, a totally false ground.

4. Cllr. Beer said that his community of Windsor & Maidenhead and the other countryside communities were very poorly served by transport. A person would need to travel several miles to be able to pick up a connection to Heathrow and none of the services were implemented properly. If people were trying to reduce pollution and get a proper controlled access route to Heathrow and reduce car use, it was necessary to address this and advance transport in a very active manner.
5. The Chairman asked if it was thought of benefit to request the presence of Alistair Duff at the next HACC meeting to explain why he thought it was inappropriate for the Committee to receive information on the buses and coaches and denied the benefit of joining the Steering Group.

The Members agreed to this suggestion.

**ACTION:**  
**BEN**  
**MORTON**

1. (d) **Minute 4035 – BAA representation at PSSC meetings/arrange meeting with Philip Carlisle.**
2. Philip Carlisle stated that the meeting had yet to be arranged. However, representation at the PSSC meeting on the morning of 25<sup>th</sup> July 2007 was good.
1. (e) **Minute 4035 – Issue a Statement re: traffic congestion due to Control Posts.**
2. The Chairman asked if BAA had an up-to-date report on this issue which had previously been raised by John Gurney and Cllr. Patrick Roberts.

Ben Morton replied that he had spoken with John Gurney prior to the HACC meeting, but had yet to speak with Cllr. Roberts. However, the presentation that was referred to at the last meeting would not have been of benefit to the Members if circulated. There was a new person in charge of Control Post Security, named Nick Dent. It was therefore suggested that separate face-to-face meetings should be held with both John Gurney and Cllr. Patrick Roberts on this issue.

**ACTION:**  
**BEN**  
**MORTON**

1. (f) **Minute 4035 – AirTrack Meeting.**
2. The Chairman reminded that Mike Forster had undertaken the task of ensuring that this meeting took place. He asked Iain Hope if he had received an update on the setting up of a meeting.

Iain Hope responded that he had not received notification of a date for the meeting, as yet.

Ben Morton stated that he was aware that considerable progress had been made on AirTrack.

Mike Forster advised that in terms of the meeting, there was an AirTrack Forum which was for the direct stakeholders involved. It had been recorded that it was the desire of the Committee to be kept in touch with progress and agreed that a volunteer would attend alternate HACC meetings to give a clear update of the current situation to the Members.

It was thought that it was early days yet to put together the planning application. However, it was suggested that an AirTrack representative should attend the September HACC meeting to discuss this further. Mike Forster said that he was happy to take the action to arrange this.

**ACTION:**  
**MIKE**  
**FORSTER**

1. (g) **Minute 4037 – Parked T5 vehicles.**
2. The Chairman said that Cllr. Patrick Roberts was concerned with T5 construction vehicles, parking up when Heathrow East was under development.
3. **(Secretary’s Note)** John Bullen (T5 Live Team) provided the following update. T5 managed deliveries onto site against PI restrictions through its Colnbrook Logistics Centre, this essentially governed access both for raw materials which were either: delivered through the adjoining railhead produced in the on site factory; and bespoke materials which were required to attend Colnbrook to be processed before being despatched onto site. This allowed the impact on surrounding areas to both be managed and monitored and also meant that PI requirements were met.

This being said there is no doubt that valuable lessons have been learnt at T5; particularly how programme impacts materials delivered, and with this in mind the same processes implemented at T5 are planned to be used for all future Heathrow construction projects but with a broader set of rules.

For the HET development, we shall have the benefit of lessons learned from T5 construction to inform the rules we put in place.

We would welcome any feedback on any inconvenience caused by vehicles attributable to HAL developments apparently not following the processes laid down, as this would help us to further improve our process.

1. (h) **Minute 4037 – Opening of T5 transport system.**
2. Paul Ellis said that he understood that most of the operators themselves would commence the services on the weekend preceding the opening of T5, which would give several days of the system running to see how this operated.

3. **(Secretary's Note)** John Bullen (T5 Live Team) provided the following update.

Current plans are that public transport services to T5 will take fare-paying passengers from the day the terminal opens, 27th March, 2008.

Notwithstanding this, there is some degree of thought being given as to whether any of the services would want to commence prior to this, which would depend on the level of demand.

1. (j) **Minute 4037 – Summary reference document of Capital Investment Programme 2007.**

2. The Technical Adviser confirmed that he was now in receipt of this document.

1. (k) **Minute 4047 – Make representation to the DfT re: Movement Quota.**

2. The Chairman stated that a letter had recently been sent on behalf of the Committee. However, there had been insufficient time lapsed to receive a reply.

3. The Technical Adviser confirmed that the letter was sent to the Secretary of State, Ruth Kelly MP, but had yet to receive a response.

1. (l) **Minute 4027 – T5 Live Volunteers** – some Members expressed interest in participating in the Terminal 5 proving trials for which some 15,000 volunteers were being sought.

Following enquiries about this, BAA has said it would be pleased to include Members of the Committee amongst the volunteers and those who wish to participate are invited to register on-line at [www.heathrowairport.com/terminal5](http://www.heathrowairport.com/terminal5)

2. Cllr. Horn asked, for people who had difficulty in registering on-line, if it would be possible to receive a telephone number.

Ben Morton replied that BAA would be going out with a concerted recruitment campaign in late August on this. All HACC Members would be contacted accordingly.

**ACTION:**  
**BEN**  
**MORTON**

#### **4054 COMMENTARY FROM THE MANAGING DIRECTOR, BAA HEATHROW**

1. (a) The Chairman welcomed Mr Mark Bullock, Managing Director of Heathrow Airport who gave an update to the Committee.

Mr. Bullock said that as ever, it had been a busy time at Heathrow, since he had last addressed the Committee in May.

BAA Heathrow had now approached the peak holiday season within the last few days, including the approaching weekend where currently in excess of 125,000 departing passengers were being handled per day.

It had been encouraging to note the Summer plans had played out so far. June's figures were that 89% of the time, passengers were clearing security in 10 minutes. For July, the performance to date had been at a similar level. There had been a number of occasions in July, when in some of the terminals BAA had been hitting 100%. At the time, passengers were clearing security in 10 minutes. There had been a consistent performance in the main.

Notwithstanding the very high volumes of traffic that BAA had been experiencing, there had been a number of external events which affected the airport in recent weeks. This started with a gas leak in Hatton Cross. An excavator sheared a high pressure gas pipe which caused the emergency services to introduce a 500 metre exclusion zone around Hatton Cross. This had the potential to disrupt the airport because of its proximity to the runways. It affected the operations of Hatton Cross Underground Station and caused closure of the staff car parks. BAA instigated its Crisis Management Team in response to this incident.

Mr. Bullock said that at the request of TRANSCO, the authority who were dealing with this incident on the ground, he suspended Arrivals for 27 minutes to assess the situation. After 27 minutes, he was able to open the runways to Arrivals again. Departures were not affected and operated as normal. During this time, eleven flights were affected and pilots chose to divert elsewhere to try to get on a stand.

Moving to security issues that arose from the attempted bombs in London. On Friday 29<sup>th</sup> June 2007, when the bombs were discovered in London, the Immigration Authorities imposed 100% immigration checks on passengers, aside from security. As a passenger went through security, they would then have to go through a 100% immigration check as well, in the terminals.

This created the immigration process to be slower and some of the security lanes had to be closed in order that people were not in the same position as they came through security and would be blocked by the immigration barriers.

Again, the Crisis Management Team were called in to deal with this, for what could have been, very serious disruption to passengers as a consequence. Queuing occurred as a result and peaked at two hours. Fortunately, the airport managed to work closely with the authorities, which enabled BAA to get some processes in place and take control of the situation.

By the Friday evening, BAA were able to get back to normal and saw a reasonable degree of operation on the Saturday. Later that night measures were stood down.

However, on that Saturday, 30<sup>th</sup> June 2007, the Glasgow Airport car bomb incident occurred. As a result of that, BAA called the management team in to Heathrow. Fortunately, there had been a programme ongoing for some time on forecourt protection measures. As could be seen, these are the concrete bollards of standard design and construction which protect the front forecourt of the terminal buildings. These were potentially already in place to prevent a vehicle from attempting to hit the front of the terminal buildings.

BAA worked very closely with the Police and the local authorities to put additional measures in place on the day. Also, in common with other airports across the UK, closed the roads nearest to the building forecourts. This caused a restriction on the amount of vehicles allowed into the airport. That, combined with vehicle checks around the airport and near to the Tunnel caused delays to passengers coming in by road vehicles. However, this was an issue common across the UK, but it had to be understood restrictions were due to circumstances that prevailed on that day.

In response to that, BAA opened up the short-term car parks as a drop-off area. This allowed passengers and their friends and relatives to use the car parks for 20 minutes free-of-charge to enable them to drop people off.

On Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2007, following the events in London on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> June 2007, there was a great deal of nervousness amongst the authorities and the members of the public. The country was on a heightened state of alert, which was understandable, given the incidents that had been recently seen.

This had the effect of putting the airport on a much higher level than usual of security alerts.

An example was quoted to demonstrate the point.

On Saturday 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2007, a vehicle broke down on the forecourt of Terminal 3. It had overheated and there was steam coming out of the radiator. People were concerned that the vehicle had been set on fire and would explode.

Mr. Bullock said that he had dialled into 'Sky News' to make what he thought was a recorded interview, but in fact he was live on air and was greeted with the question that 'it was understood that a bomb had gone off in Terminal 3 and could he confirm this'. Fortunately, he was aware of the situation and was able to quell the concerns. However, this implicated the nervousness that was shown around that time.

The situation caused many security alerts, some of which resulted in evacuations of certain areas of the airport. The most serious of these took place on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2007 in Terminal 4, where it was necessary to conduct a full-scale evacuation from Airside to Landside. This caused serious disruption to the passengers and to normal operations, which ran into the following day.

Given the circumstances, it was thought that the staff did a very good job in assisting passengers. Mr. Bullock said once again, he was proud of the way that the staff responded to the challenge of dealing with people who had experienced serious delays, and showed compassion to the travelling public.

Mr. Bullock said over the past few weeks, BAA had been working on initiatives to try to improve the service and perception amongst passengers of the airport. There had been much work ongoing.

There was a programme which was referred to internally by BAA as 'Fix the Basics'. This comprised over 360 individual line items that need reviewing in the short-term. It ranged from items, such as bringing forward refurbishment of 14 toilets that were not on the list for refurbishment, increasing the spend on the cleaning contract and the number of cleaners employed and to introduce litter pickers.

One of the frustrations was the litter that could be seen at the airport. Due to security reasons, it was not possible to provide bins for the passengers, who did not know how to dispose of the litter. However, this would be addressed by introducing litter pickers.

Areas such as the main CTA main wall Tunnel will be cleaned and the side wall tunnel and stairwells will be painted. Flowers had also been planted outside the Police Station across the road.

Mr. Bullock said that £9 million had been allocated to that programme. This sum was in addition to the annual maintenance programme. He had also advised his shareholders that he would like to spend a further £2 million on top. Progress was being made.

Looking forward, on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2007, BAA had introduced a trial in the FCC, designed to see if it was possible to move toward the removal of the one bag only allowance. The Department for Transport had agreed to this trial. This was being carried out on a day-to-day basis.. The trial was looking at two aspects. Firstly, that the impact on the effectiveness of security measures was maintained whilst using new technology and secondly, the impact this had on the passengers. BAA had a plan and hoped that the trial would be successful.

Mr. Bullock said that it was early days, but certainly when he observed the second day of the trial in operation, he could already see the feel of the effect on the passengers was better.

If a passenger boarded an aircraft in America, with two bags cleared through security and arrived at Heathrow to transfer to another airline flight, one bag would need to either be checked-in, or the passenger would need to make two bags fit into one bag or dispose of it altogether.

Mr. Bullock said that he had seen the sense of unease and discomfort of tension due to the one bag policy had gone from a passenger point of view. He hoped that this trial was a good move.

Subject to the results of the trial and DfT approval, BAA would like to roll this out to other transfer areas of the airport and beyond, as the passengers welcomed this.

New technology had been mentioned as one of drivers, and as universally seen was X-Ray technology. In addition to those pieces of kit installed in the FCC for transfers, BAA had taken delivery of 8 new X-Ray machines into Terminal 4 and also ordered 75 new state-of-the- art Archway Metal Detectors. It was hoped to roll these out in August, subject to supply and performance.

BAA hoped to demonstrate to the DfT that the capability of the machine and performance may be able to change some of the security measures, to be able to move forward.

Mr. Bullock said that Terminal 5 ever gets closer to the opening in March 2008. On 17<sup>th</sup> September 2007, the proving trials will commence. A good response had been received to the request for volunteers to participate as potential passengers and see Terminal 5 firsthand. The project remained on time and on budget.

The recruitment process on- line was well underway.

BAA had also handed over the Piccadilly Line extension to Terminal 5 to London Underground.

Mr. Bullock recalled that when he previously addressed the Committee at the last HACC meeting, the Lord Mayor of London was considering the planning application made by BAA for Heathrow East. This process had now been completed and the application had been approved.

On a positive note, the airport had chosen to support a Charity of the Year. Rather than providing assistance and help on a piecemeal basis to many different charities, BAA had decided to focus all of its efforts into one worthy cause. The staff were offered a choice of charities and they chose to support Marie Curie Cancer Care, which was a very worthwhile cause. The funds raised will enable Marie Curie to provide 5000 hours of care to cancer patients in the area around Heathrow. BAA looked forward to working with them.

Mark Bullock stated that a group of environmental activists had announced that they planned to hold a 'Climate Camp' near the vicinity of the airport between the 14<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> August 2007 to protest against aviation and climate change.

Whilst BAA supported their lawful right to express their views, the airport would take all the measures necessary to ensure that they did not damage in any way or disrupt the normal activities of the airport in that regard.

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

1. Philip Carlisle stated that he knew that British Airways, together with other organisations like the Guild of Travel Management Companies were already lobbying Ruth Kelly MP about the single bag limit. From the point of view of business travellers, who could get away with two bags as their hold luggage, to some extent had to be an advantage to the airport system. Also, from BAA's point of view particularly because of transfer in transit problems.

It was hoped that the DfT would be very much behind BAA and that the trials would work which would make life for everybody a great deal better.

It was stressed that the request for a two bag allowance was only within the restricted size, but two bags rather than one would be a great move forward.

2. Iain Hope said that he supported the comment made by Philip Carlisle. He stated that the London Chamber of Commerce had received many complaints about this problem of restrictions of baggage.

Security was absolutely vital for their Members, and they very conscious of it. However, it was felt that the confusion over it and the delays were unsatisfactory, in terms of their experiences through the airport.

For the Ladies, the question of liquids in hand luggage was still a problem, in relation to confusion over exactly what a passenger was or was not allowed to carry and the quantities involved. This was a big issue. Anything that could be done to sort this matter out with the Department for Transport would be welcomed.

Iain Hope commended the progress of Terminal 5, which he was delighted about. He said that BAA should keep up the good work. He thought that a vote of thanks should go to Tony Douglas (former BAA Divisional Director and Chief Executive) for the years he had spent on this project, both in achieving progress so far and its safety record, which BAA had every reason to be proud of.

With regard to the development of Heathrow East, any suggestion that was floating around in the newspapers about possible delays in the progress of this project due to finance and other reasons, obviously was a source of great worry to the London Chamber of Commerce, amongst many others. This issue should be addressed.

3. Virginia Godfrey referred to the Noise Exposure Contours 2006 which had been published. It was suggested that it would be helpful if all of the Members received a hard copy of this document. A request was made for a presentation to be made on the subject to the Committee.

Virginia Godfrey also referred to the Noise Maps which need to be submitted to Defra. It was understood that under the ERCD Directive there needed to be an Action Plan and that BAA had to involve local people in groups in preparation of this. Virginia asked if there was a timetable that could be given and an assurance made that this would be done.

David Gray responded that a brief reference had been made to noise mapping in the PSDH Report.

However, he understood that in relation to the sequencing, the Heathrow maps and maps from other airports had been delivered to Defra. It was up to Defra to decide how and when they would publish these. It was believed that their intention is to publish them altogether. Defra would then need to issue guidance to airports in terms of how they should prepare Action Plans. It was understood that this Plan was still in preparation. It would therefore be a further period of time before BAA Heathrow would be able to put that Plan into action.

Virginia Godfrey asked if the Members would each receive a hard copy of the Noise Contours.

David Gray said that he would take this request back to the DfT office. **ACTION:**  
**DAVID**  
**GRAY**

4. The Chairman asked who would be the best organisation to give a presentation on the Noise Contours.

David Gray responded that the Report was fairly short and as the Committee were aware, the Noise Contours were produced on an annual basis. He was therefore unsure whether there would be a great deal to say on these.

The Report was put together for the DfT by the CAA. Again, he would take this request back to the DfT to discuss further with colleagues.

**ACTION:**  
**DAVID**  
**GRAY**

5. Cllr. Bishop referred to two issues; firstly, the backlog of baggage at the airport and secondly, the fact that some taxi drivers had been granted permission by BAA to by-pass the taxi feeder park system at Heathrow. A reason had not been given. It was a very real ongoing problem with the taxis, which must be addressed.

Paul Ellis responded to the first aspect. He said that the issue was related to the security problems which had been encountered since August of last year. As Members were aware, passengers were only allowed to take one bag onto the aircraft in the cabin. This meant that there were large, extra volumes of baggage which were flowing through the baggage system, which was already operating at near to capacity. It was now needing to operate on a sustainable basis, seeking to over capacity, which meant that anything could provoke a rapid 'snow-balling' out of control with the arrangements.

On top of that, there were particular circumstances with the disruption of Terminal 4, following on from the Glasgow incident, which meant that the terminal was evacuated. Again, this meant that baggage was delayed at the airport.

Until the underlying issue of the carrying of two bags into the cabin rather than only one was dealt with, the system was not able to cope in practical terms, with the volumes of baggage on a sustainable basis. Clearly, British Airways will be able to deal with that as and when the security situation changes, so that two bags could be taken onto the aircraft by the passengers and also there will be the additional capacity from Terminal 5.

With regard to the situation with the baggage handlers, as could be imagined, they were under an enormous strain from all of this pressure. They were carrying out an extremely difficult job very well. They had received much support from additional volunteers to keep the 'show on the road'.

Mark Bullock responded to the reference made by Cllr. Bishop on the taxi drivers. He said that he was aware of the issue, as he had seen copies of the correspondence between BAA and the taxi trade. However, he did not think that it was appropriate for him to comment.

6. John Gurney referred to the matter of security passes.

He had raised this issue at the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting on the morning of 25<sup>th</sup> July 2007.

He stated that the duration it took to process the security passes for new staff was such, that by the time the security checks had been completed and people found that they could work, they had left the company and moved on to another job, as they were not interested.

From a recruitment point of view, this was not only relevant to British Airways, most of the airlines were experiencing the same problem.

7. John Gurney referred to the item raised on baggage into Milan. He said that bags did not go by air, they had been sent by truck. The reason for this was that transport required all of those bags to be re-X-Rayed. Essentially, there were approximately 25,000 bags to be re-X-Rayed.

The facilities at Heathrow could not cope. For the bags that were destined for Europe, it was found to be easier to truck these over to Milan where they could be dealt with through their facilities.

Bags were sent to Stansted and Gatwick to be X-Rayed, bonded and then brought back to Heathrow, in order that they could be forwarded on to their final destinations. It was a complicated operation.

8. John Gurney referred to Terminal 4. He said that for the interior, it would be the first time it would receive a 'lick of paint' since it was built in the 1980's. He asked if this was budgeted out of the £9 million, or if it was taken from another budget.

Mark Bullock responded that the 'lick of paint' in Terminal 4 was agreed in March 2007. When referring to the actions within the £9 million, this was included.

9. John Gurney asked if BAA Lynton had been sold or partially sold to finance BAA's re-development plans.

Mark Bullock replied that he did not know, as this was not an airport issue.

10. Roger Wiltshire representing the British Air Transport Association (BATA) said his organisation had been involved with the Secretary of State the previous week, as that they were very keen to work with the airports on the organisation of the different security regimes so that the passengers did not get confused, particularly with the high-profile rule of the one bag only per passenger in the cabin, which applied and affected Heathrow, almost more than any other airport.

The description of the trial for baggage improvements was good, but mainly technological. He asked if there were still remaining issues relating to manpower and staffing resources.

Mark Bullock responded that the reason that technology was a tentative solution to the baggage problem was that BAA needed to maintain the effectiveness of the security regime. Technology enabled this to happen and was more appropriate.

Manpower was not the issue with regard to trials. However, notwithstanding this, BAA were once again, on the recruitment trail. Approximately 500 additional Security Officers had been appointed since October of last year to the beginning of this year. BAA had now embarked upon an even larger recruitment programme to effectively increase the capacity of the airport staff to focus on these issues.

11. Margaret Majumdar referred to the Traffic Statistics Report and asked for clarification on a point that she did not understand.

The number of movements in the left-hand column were said to be rounded and yet it gave, what appeared to be actual figures. Margaret asked if confirmation could be given that these figures were precise and not rounded up or down or sideways.

Ben Morton confirmed that these were actual numbers.

The Chairman thanked Mark Bullock for his attendance at the HACC meeting.

2. (b) Discussion on matters to be reported by BAA Heathrow management had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.  
(c) BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been tabled and was noted.

3. **Terror attack, competition and economy hit traffic figures**

BAA's UK airports handled a total of 13.8 million passengers in June, a decline of 0.6% on June 2006. Of our individual airports, Gatwick grew 1.3%, whilst Heathrow and Stansted dipped by 1.8% and 1.9% respectively. Southampton fell 1.3%. In Scotland, Aberdeen and Edinburgh saw respective gains of 7.5% and 3.6%.

The recent attempted terrorist attack at Glasgow contributed to a fall of 2.4% as more than 60 per cent of flights were cancelled or diverted when the airport was temporarily closed in the immediate aftermath of the incident.

The softening economy, interest rate rises, fiercer competition for Heathrow from European hubs (which is not helped by the UK's one hand baggage restriction) and a buoyant business flight market (meaning less discounted flights overall) also contributed to the fall in traffic figures.

4. **Heathrow East – Mayor's decision Heathrow East application**

Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone, made a positive decision on the Heathrow East planning application in May and Heathrow has received the final planning permission from the London Borough of Hillingdon.

The new terminal is not a capacity increase, but will play a major part in transforming Heathrow for passengers. It will be built on the site of Terminal 2 and the Queen's Building and eventually replace Terminals 1 and 2. BAA's ambition is for Phase 1 of Heathrow East to open in time for the London Olympics in 2012. Together with Terminal 5, this would mean that most of Heathrow's passengers will be travelling through terminals that aren't open today.

Heathrow East will also improve the airport's environmental performance - cutting carbon dioxide emissions by around 40% compared to the buildings it will replace. BAA also have plans to use biomass gasification to fuel the Heathrow East energy centre. This involves using sustainable forests and waste wood to provide cooling, heat and power to the terminal and supports one of the key priorities for renewable energy in the Mayor's Climate Change Action Plan.

5. **Climate Camp**

On 24 May 2007, a group of environmental activists announced that they planned to hold a 'Climate Camp' near Heathrow Airport between the 14 and 21 August. In their press release, the group stated:

*“This summer thousands of people will gather near Heathrow Airport at this year's Camp for Climate Action for eight days of education, sustainable living and direct action against the root causes of climate change....*

*Mass direct action will disrupt the activities of the airport and the aviation industry, but in the interests of public safety there will be no attempt to blockade runways”*

Last year, the same environmental protestors set up camp at Drax Power Station with around 600 protestors camping for the week and another 1000 participating in the day of action.

Police believe that this year's Climate Camp at Heathrow will be significantly larger than the camp at Drax.

The Climate Camp represents a significant operational threat to BAA Heathrow.

#### 6. **Future Heathrow**

BAA joined Future Heathrow, a coalition of airlines, trade unions and businesses lobbying for the sustainable expansion of the airport.

The group believes failing to develop Heathrow will leave the UK vulnerable to foreign competition as its two runways are already operating at near capacity. This compares to Frankfurt's three runways, Paris Charles De Gaulle's four and Amsterdam Schiphol's five - which all operate at less than 75% of their capacity.

#### 7. **Web Trak Launch**

Heathrow Airport has launched a new state of the art aircraft track replay system called 'WebTrak'. The innovative system will enable local residents to see flight tracks for aircraft using Heathrow and details of their heights and flight number.

The system is part of an improved aircraft noise website for local residents. It will help local people find out more about the likely effects of aircraft noise in their communities, understand why they are hearing noise from planes and enable them to make enquiries or complaints online.

The website is designed to complement the services provided to members of the public by Heathrow's Operations Communications Team who investigate enquiries and complaints from residents. Similar websites have also been launched at BAA's other two London Airports, Gatwick and Stansted.

The site is available at [www.heathrowairport.com/noise](http://www.heathrowairport.com/noise)

#### 8. **Airport smoking ban**

BAA's English airports become smoke free on 1<sup>st</sup> July (the Scottish airports implemented the ban last year). The ban makes it illegal to smoke in enclosed public places which means that smoking inside the terminal buildings is prohibited. For safety reasons, smoking remains prohibited in external areas airside. Separate smoking areas will be provided for staff and passengers outside the terminal buildings at all airports. Information for passengers is available on BAA.com under the individual airport information section.

9. **Success for technology trial**

Biometric technology could reduce queue times at security screening and passport control according to a new report. The miSense project was launched in November 2006 and delivered by a consortium of nine private and Government sector organisations. Heathrow Terminal 3 staged the 16-week biometric trial, where 3,166 passengers participated in a variety of passport, finger-print, iris and facial scanning. Around 89 per cent of users said they would “recommend the service to a fellow traveller” and 72 per cent stated “faster journey times” through the airport as the most important benefit.

10. **T5 Rails and Tunnels Milestones**

This month the rail and tunnels team met a number of important milestones as part of the testing and commissioning of the transportation systems for Terminal 5.

On 17 July, the Track Transit System team began a 30 day reliability test of the Automated People Mover (APM) - the system which ferries passengers between the main terminal building and the satellite. For this phase one system demonstration, the project team will be operating the APM 24 hours per day until it has been able to demonstrate reliability of 98.5% for 30 continuous days and achieved 99.75% for 7 continuous days during this same period.

Additionally, the Piccadilly Extension Line was handed over to London Underground on 1st July. This was a key milestone met and the culmination of five years' hard work by the combined T5 and London Underground teams. The handover triggered the immediate commencement of London Underground's 'Trial Operations' period during which drivers and operators become familiar and are trained in the use of the infrastructure and for the first time tube trains have been run into the new station.

11. **T5 Health and Safety**

Also this month, T5 project team achieved over one million man-hours without a reportable accident for the NINTH time in T5's history. T5's best run without a reportable accident currently lies at 2.25 million hours - an exceptional achievement for a project the size and scale of T5.

12. **Terminal 5 Trials**

The Terminal 5 trials online registration pages are now live and so far we've had an overwhelming response, with over 1000 volunteers registering on the first day alone.

The first two trials are for staff only, thereafter we will allocate 15% of the trial places to staff and the rest will be open to the general public.

BAA need 15,000 volunteers to come play the role of British Airways passengers. The trials begin on 18th September and run until March 2008. They will test everything from timing the movements of the aircraft on the tarmac, to streaming 2000 volunteer passengers through the central security area, immigration, baggage and arrivals to name but a few.

All volunteers who attend the trials will be rewarded with a Terminal 5 gift bag and have a chance to win a British Airways flight. Plus, for every volunteer who attends, we'll donate £1 to Marie Curie Cancer Care, Heathrow's charity of the year.

This is the link for registration:

<http://www.heathrowairport.com/portal/controller/dispatcher.jsp?ChPath=XYZTerminal5>

13. **Heathrow Family Day**

Heathrow Rotary Club were joined by staff from BAA Heathrow, other airport workers and members of the local community to raise over £9,000 for local good causes at the annual Heathrow Airport Family Fun Day.

The event, which was held on June 17 at the newly-refurbished Heathrow Academy, attracted several thousand guests who came to enjoy a packed programme of activities and attractions including tours of the airport, a display by the airport fire service and performances by the British Airways Brass Band.

14. **Heathrow Charity of the Year**

Marie Curie Cancer Care is first ever Heathrow's Charity of the Year. The campaign will kick-off in late July 2007 with an action-packed programme of events.

**4055 UPDATE BY BAA ON THE VORTEX INSURANCE SCHEME FOR ROOF REPAIRS**

1. Update report by BAA on the Vortex Protection Scheme to protect homes around the airport had been circulated with Agenda and was noted.
2. Cllr. Peter De Vic Carrey referred to the blanket scheme in place for Vortex, where 55% of streets affected were covered. He asked if it was the intention of BAA to include any additional streets in the scheme's listing.

Mike Forster responded that BAA was not aware of any needing to be added.

3. The Chairman asked if it would be possible to provide a list of the streets by name that were included in the scheme.

Mike Forster replied that certainly if any changes were made, this could be made clear.

4. Rob Gibson asked in relation to the Vortex Protection Scheme Update circulated with the Agenda, if it was possible to learn for what time period this covered at it did not give any dates.

The Technical Adviser responded that he did ask for a report about this from BAA.

However, the people concerned had said that the Update as given was the best they could offer, which was an extract from BAA's Corporate Responsibility Report which had just been published.

However, it would be very helpful if the Committee could get some idea, perhaps a map with the strikes shown on them, as it may be that due to the complexity of Vortexes, that Terminal 5 may make some difference to aircraft which are landing from the West, when the airport was on easterlies. There were different occurrences depending on what the winds and climate are. If it was possible to obtain more detail, it would be of benefit, to see whether Terminal 5 and the climate was causing any long-term changes.

#### **4056 BAA PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS IN AREAS TO THE NORTH OF HEATHROW**

1. The representative of EANAG had asked that BAA Heathrow should report to the Committee on progress with it's negotiations with residents of the area of Sipson, how many properties have been bought to date and how many the company has acquired an option on.
2. Margaret Majumdar re-outlined her request for information. She asked how much progress BAA had made towards getting out the residents of Sipson, so that they would be able to start on a third runway, quickly or less quickly, and how long this would be likely to take to get to the point when works could commence.

Ben Morton responded that all of the residents of Sipson had been made aware that they could participate in the Property Market Support Bond Scheme, if they so wished, which was a voluntary scheme.

BAA Heathrow had not yet purchased any property under this scheme. As the policy states, the Bond Holders could sell their properties to BAA Heathrow, when BAA Heathrow makes an announcement of its intention to apply for planning permission. BAA did not offer to purchase properties. It was the option of the Bond Holder to exercise its right, once BAA had announced its intention to apply for planning permission.

Ben Morton said that he had also asked further and spoken to BAA's solicitors, who were not aware of any instruction to purchase property at this time.

Margaret Majumdar asked how many householders did BAA have agreement with under the scheme which was announced a year or so ago.

Mike Forster responded that there would appear to be a misunderstanding around the nature of the scheme. It was called a Blight Scheme. When BAA published the Draft Interim Master Plan two years ago, there was an area of land which might be required for a third runway and an associated terminal.

To protect the properties for any of those individuals who lived within that area of land they were given a Bond. which stated that if BAA gets to the point where a planning application was made, they would respect a request to buy that property at the market rate effective in 2002. prior to the publication of the Aviation White Paper. It would only become effective at that stage.

BAA were not in the market to buy up properties, but were protecting people's property values whilst the Government went through the process of the Aviation White Paper's Project for the Sustainable Development of Heathrow (PSDH). It was not even a policy statement about the third runway.

Mrs. Majumdar asked if BAA had asked for a response from the residents to the communication that had been sent out to them.

Mike Forster replied that BAA had asked people to apply for the Bond. The majority of households had applied for this.

Margaret Majumdar asked how many households had applied for this.

Mike Forster replied that he was unable to quote an exact figure, but would follow this up and report back with a number.

**ACTION:**  
**MIKE**  
**FORSTER**

**(Secretary's Note): BAA Response** - There are 665 residential properties and 60 commercial properties within the Property Market Support Bond boundary. All are eligible to apply, so long as the rateable value as of 2000 is less than £24,600. To date, BAA Heathrow has received significant enquiries and applications for the scheme so far. We do not publish exact numbers.

## **PRESENTATION**

### **4057 THE SLOT ALLOCATION SCHEME FOR HEATHROW AND IT'S IMPLICATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL FLIGHTS**

1. Presentation by James Cole, Director of Coordination for Airport Coordination Limited, which is the independent slot coordinator with sole responsibility for the allocation of slot arrangements in accordance with EU regulations at most of the major airports in the UK, including Heathrow (*as enclosed*).

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

2. The Chairman stated that there had always been a great mystery around slot purchase. However, from the facts given in the presentation, it would seem to be a simple case of two individuals or groups agreeing.

James Cole replied that this was correct. The transaction needs to be confirmed in the database. For a change of use of slot using a larger aircraft into a different terminal, they would need to check that the other capacities at the airport could handle that, but *in principle*, these are by matter of arrangement with the carriers.

Although there are some ambiguities in the EU Regulation on the matter, the company had been doing this for many years. It had been the subject of High Court Challenge, but ruled in ACL's favour, as their practice was permissible.

3. Philip Carlisle made reference to terminal capacity mentioned as a relative factor and bigger aeroplanes replacing smaller ones. He asked how far away BAA anticipated being from any form of terminal capacity issue, should ACL's forecast of OpenSkies and the US Business Agreement turn out to be correct.

James Cole responded that ACL had many terminal capacity issues today. As stated, terminal capacity is based on the number of passengers per hour which can be handled e.g. there would be certain hours in the day when the terminal was already running at capacity. Terminal 3 and Terminal 4, at the beginning of the day at Arrivals, are at capacity and another flight could not be fitted in at all. However, if the flight was at a slightly different time of day, it would be possible to fit it in.

Another factor was that OpenSkies would not take place until Terminal 5 opened. There was terminal capacity at the airport, although it might not exactly be in the terminal that the airline wishes it to be.

4. Mike Forster referred to the question when more capacity comes on. The answer to this is 8 months 2 days time. When BAA had undertaken the airlines move sequence, they would use a schedule of their assumptions around the likely OpenSkies profile of the testing of distribution of capacities around the airport, to safeguard on that issue should it happen.

The largest likely growth would probably be in SkyTeam based in Terminal 4. BAA were reconfiguring the stands. By the time that T5 opened, 84 out of a total of 152 would be reconfigured.

5. Iain Hope stated that ACL were responsible for the coordination of European slot allocation at Heathrow, but also for destinations such as Dublin, which also had tight slot situation.

In the slot allocation, it raised a question about European and long-haul time zone problems; there might be a few slots available at Heathrow, but there was no point in having these if there was no match up of slot allocations together with these times.

Iain asked if this was the responsibility of ACL or the airline.

James Cole responded that this was an industry responsibility. This went beyond Europe. It was matching up slots from all across the world. This was handled by scheduling conferences which were held twice a year, hosted by IATA, where all of the airlines and the co-ordinators from around the world get together to iron out these problems.

6. Margaret Majumdar stated that if there were to be more long-haul flights and therefore less short-haul, this meant that there would be a larger proportion of departing aeroplanes turning right at the end of the runway on westerlies and turning left on easterlies, so that the splits that were affected by departures would have different proportions.

James Cole replied that this question was somewhat beyond his competence to answer. However, there were regular shifts in the month. OpenSkies was perhaps a more sophisticated example of it. There were changes in slots, as a continuing process. However, it was not known if this would lead to a particular trend.

7. Mike Forster commented that he also would not be able to comment within the existing limits.
8. Rob Gibson asked if in the circumstances, there was a step change in the slots available, i.e. mixed-mode goes forward, how would these slots be allocated; would people purchase them or would they be given away.

James Cole replied that slots were allocated freely in accordance with an EU Regulation. It listed out a set of priorities known as 'new entrants' strictly for new small airlines and airlines serving into new routes.

The current rule set was an administrative allocation. Whether that would be the regulatory landscape for the future was unknown. Regular reviews were undertaken on this matter. There was a review ongoing at present. The Department for Transport had appointed consultants to look at performance and alternative mechanisms.

9. Cllr. Beer said that the big mystery for most people was with regard to ‘grandfather rights’ and how long they exist for. He asked if the holders of these rights held a privilege which they could sell on, and how this fitted in with the EU Regulation.

James Cole responded that an airline’s ‘grandfather rights’ was a Season upon Season renewable entitlement, subject to the use. The airline had to use the slots for at least 80% of the time in a Season, in order to retain the right to those slots in the next Season (e.g. Summer to Summer or Winter to Winter).

The airline did not have ‘grandfather rights’ for a particular period of time, they had to keep earning these rights to retain it. Not many airlines were foolish enough to fail the use requirement.

Mr. Cole said that the secondary market in slots sat alongside the primary allocation of slots. There were some slots available in a pool and those were made available to new entrants. If secondary trading was prohibited, it would be foolish to assume that the airlines would give the slots back to the co-ordinator. If the airlines were not making use of the slots, there might be another airline who would be willing to make better use of these slots. Therefore, the secondary market was a useful adjunct to the administrative allocation and helped to lubricate the system and to achieve more economic efficient use of slots. The two concepts rubbed along together.

10. Rob Gibson referred to a recent Press article where it had stated that an aircraft had been flown to Cardiff, empty, because of the ruling on slots. He asked if this was the true reason. He thought that if it was correct, it was totally ridiculous.

James Cole replied that in essence, this was a circumstance, where normally this would be avoided, through the secondary market. If an airline had a spare set of slots, because the secondary market exists, they could either sell or loan these out to another airline. In this way, at least they would be put to some productive use.

However, the reason that the Cardiff position arose was because the slots became surplus very late in the day. This was because they were being flown by an airline, whose main operation was to Beirut. It may be recalled that year, the Israeli’s bombed Beirut from July. It was not until September when it was clear that the airline, in order to survive, needed to protract its operation slightly. However, it was too late in the day to find an alternative use for the slots.

Mr. Cole said that he would argue that the existence of the secondary market meant that those sort of situations arose much less frequently.

11. Cllr. Roberts asked if it was yet known which carriers will start from Heathrow next year.

Mr. Cole stated that it was known that all of the airlines were interested, although

arrangements to acquire slots had yet to be finalised. The allocation of slots will be completed by October 2007. By the beginning of November 2007, it will be clear which carriers will have access.

The Chairman thanked James Cole for his informative presentation.

**4058 HEATHROW CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY REPORT 2006/2007**

1. The report for 2006/2007 was published at the end of June and copies of the summary were supplied for information and debate by Members.

The Chairman stated that the full version of the report could be accessed via the BAA website.

**4059 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 in brief, the DfT were concluding the environmental assessment status of the Project for the Sustainable Development of Heathrow and were on track to conduct a public consultation during the Autumn.

The report contained comment on the Freedom of Information activity since the last Committee meeting, at which some of the organisations represented on HACC had been active.

The DfT had also completed a round of engagements with a number of stakeholders, including local authorities via the local authority officers about arrangements for consultation.

A group of Heathrow MPs also met with the Minister Gillian Merron (predecessor to Jim Fitzpatrick) just before the end of her tenure and talked about the consultation process.

The DfT had also engaged at an official level of the Department with environmental NGOs for 'Future Heathrow' and several other organisations, which had helped help them to frame their views on the conduct of the consultation and the public exhibitions.

Mr. Gray said that his report had reminded the Members of the key scope of the consultation and the questions that it would expect to be asking and some of the plans for publicising the consultation.

3. The Chairman asked if there was a way in which the Committee could be more closely involved with the consultation process, and if by the time the next HACC meeting was held on 25th September 2007, would the consultation still be going strong.

David Gray replied that it was not expected that the consultation would be launched by 25<sup>th</sup> September 2007. A further update could be brought to that meeting, when the plans for the exhibitions would be that much clearer.

The Chairman followed this through with the fact that the Committee would be holding its Annual Seminar in early December 2007. He asked if this would be an appropriate time to have several people address the Members about this.

David Gray responded that this suggestion could be taken back to the DfT office for consideration.

**ACTION:**  
**DAVID**  
**GRAY**

4. Cllr. Peter de Vic Carey asked if it was possible to have a more definite date of events of the consultation in the Autumn.

Mr. Gray responded that he could not be more specific, because the firm dates had not actually yet been put in the diary. As the Members were aware, such matters tended to be decided at a relatively late stage, depending on other events happening in the political arena elsewhere.

Mr. Gray said that from his previous comments at the HACC meetings, it had been made clear that it would not be in September. The Committee would convene again before the consultation was launched, but he was not in a position to say when that would be.

Cllr. Peter de Vic Carey requested that at least a clear three-months plus should be given to consider the consultation documents to gauge reaction.

David Gray said that the DfT had always said that there would be at least three months for the consultation and possibly longer.

5. Cllr. Elengorn stated that there was a great deal of concern in Richmond that the number and scope of the consultations had been inadequate given the huge interest in the matter. He asked if consideration had been given to more exhibitions.

David Gray responded that resources were obviously finite. The DfT were planning approximately a dozen exhibitions around the area of the airport, typically from Windsor in the West to Richmond in the East and Langley in the North to Egham in the South.

The final details and venues had not yet been determined. Clearly, it will be open to people to attend any one of those exhibitions. The Department thought that this should allow a reasonable scope of opportunity.

Cllr. Elengorn said that note had to be taken of the people who might wish to come in to an exhibition, where the areas was accessible, but did not have a mode of transport.

David Gray responded that this fact had certainly been taken into account.

6. Virginia Godfrey said that at the previous HACC meeting she had raised the point of arrival paths and a map of flight paths, particularly new ones. The question was asked if these would be included in the consultation.

David Gray replied that it was the intention of the DfT to illustrate arrival and departure paths. As explained at the previous HACC meeting, the detailed departure routes etc. would not be settled in the context of this consultation.

They would be a subject to be determined later on in the proposals to take forward. The information received in the consultation would be illustrative.

7. Virginia Godfrey asked if it was the case that a Health Impact Assessment would be included in the consultation.

David Gray responded that he thought that this was not the case. It was understood that the White Paper accepted that the Health Impact Assessment, strictly speaking, was a matter for the planning process and to be prepared in the context of planning applications.

Comment would be made on this issue at the meeting to be held on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2007 with the Department of Health, to talk through the extensive consultation documents and to address health matters.

8. Virginia Godfrey said she had observed that the final Report of the 'Attitudes to Noise' Study which commenced in 2001 (ANASE) had been received and was being considered by the DfT Steering Group. It was thought appropriate every Member of HACC should receive a copy of this Report as soon as possible.

David Gray responded that the ANASE Report was being considered by the DfT Steering Group at a meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2007. It was the intention that the Report should be published some time after the Summer.

Virginia Godfrey asked if HACC could receive a copy of the Report before the consultation was issued.

9. The Chairman commented that he understood the Report would need to go to the ANMAC Group first.

David Gray replied that the Report had been prepared for the DfT by consultants. However, he was unsure if the process assumed that the Report would go to ANMAC before it was published, or if it was the subject for discussion once it had been published.

10. The Technical Adviser commented that he had spoken with the Chairman of the Aircraft Noise Monitoring Advisory Committee (ANMAC) to request that a meeting should be arranged in light of the fact that the last meeting was approximately 18 months ago. The Chairman had agreed that a meeting would be organised, probably in late September 2007 and that one of the major items on the Agenda would be the ANASE Study to which Virginia Godfrey had referred.

David Gray responded that he believed that the question of timing between the ANASE and the PSDH consultation had not been settled.

11. Virginia Godfrey suggested if the Report was to be available and considered by ANMAC in late September, perhaps it could be made available to HACC Members in early October.
12. Cllr. Bishop pointed out that the LB Hillingdon were very alarmed to learn from a Seminar they had attended and Paper read, entitled 'Planning for Sustainable Future' that

the Government proposed to provide two main measures for infrastructures for very large proposals and review the country planning systems.

The idea would be to produce a National Policy Statement to divide nationally certificated infrastructures, to provide greater certainty to promote national infrastructure projects and streamline the procedures for national infrastructure projects, but most importantly, create an Independent Commission to decide applications for national certificated infrastructures.

Cllr. Bishop thought that the Independent Commission would be like the Committee that decided on interest rates. They would probably be heavily loaded with Gordon Brown's left-wing people who would want to put this through. They had also stated that they wished to promote public participation across the whole process.

Some of the reviews had stated 'that the concerns were the key changes proposed to establish a new non-elected quango. The infrastructure planning commission was called to determine nationally significant infrastructure projects that exist (e.g. Heathrow). No doubt the Government had responded to the perceived needs of UK Plc. (all the residents) and was mindful of the lengthy Terminal 5 Inquiry, for which such Inquiries they obviously wish to speed up, but nevertheless, this Independent Planning Commission represented a fundamental shift of power to the centre, away from local planning authorities and local democracy'.

Cllr. Bishop stated that local planning authorities e.g. LB Hillingdon, would be reduced to the role of mere consultees and that he did not hold out a great deal of hope.

Geoff Pope responded that clearly this was a matter of great importance to the whole of London. He said that it would be helpful if a presentation could be made to London Assembly members who would be able to take a London-wide view in their response.

David Gray agreed to take this action away for further consideration.

**ACTION:**  
**DAVID**  
**GRAY**

13. Rob Gibson briefly returned to the point made by Virginia Godfrey in relation to the ANASE Report and asked David Gray what the Report was actually for.

He said that he had looked back to the Ministerial Statement which implied that ANASE was linked to the forthcoming consultation on the Air Transport White Paper.

Also, was it correct to say that the ANASE Report would miss the consultation for the PSDH. If so, what was the purpose of the Report and its use for the future. Would it be revisiting the noise metric in the future, whether it be higher or lower, dependent on what it states.

David Gray responded that he understood that the ANASE Report was to revisit the question as to whether the current noise Leq metric, satisfactorily represented the noise annoyance. This was the main gist of the brief as given and would be the substance of the Report.

The Report would be from the consultants to the Department for Transport.

The question of how that was then impacted on policy making and noise policy in the future was a process which would need to be followed in terms of discussion and further debate.

In answer to Rob Gibson's question, the Report was aimed to review and assess whether it was necessary to move towards a different level of metric from the 57 dBA contour and it would inform development of policy thereafter.

Mr. Gray said that he was not saying, when stating that a decision had been taken as to whether the ANASE Report had any direct impact on PSDH specifically, or not. The fact was that there would be a good deal of further discussion and consultation before an actual noise policy change was put in place, if it was proposed by ANASE. This was not something the DfT would expect to do, necessarily, in the time of the PSDH.

14. Margaret Majumdar said that she was alarmed to read the last point on page 1 of the Progress Note which stated that 'there would be a brief comment on analysis of runway alternation in the 06.00 hrs. to 07.00 hrs. period, and night time rotation (as between westerly and easterly operations)'.

She feared that this might mean that there was consideration of putting more after 11.30 p.m. departures out over Ealing. A request was made if this could be 'not confirmed'.

Mrs. Majumdar also asked how far the leaflet distribution to raise awareness of the consultation would extend and if Ealing would be included, as it was feared that the residents were very much affected by the proposals raised in this consultation.

David Gray responded to the first point raised. He said that there was no conspiracy. The DfT had undertaken monitoring, on what is currently, a trial of the runway alternation during 06.00 hrs – 07.00 hrs. and would be reporting the results of this. Night time rotation was a system of procedures, put in place some time ago. Again, monitoring had been undertaken on this and the results would be reported on it.

With regard to the second point as to whether Ealing was within the leaflet drop zone, it was thought that this was a point of detail.

Mrs. Majumdar emphasised that this was not a point of detail as far as the residents of Ealing were concerned and it was hoped that the Committee would press the DfT to ensure that Ealing would be included.

15. The Chairman commented that the HACC Members around the table reflected the area which was likely to be the problem area.

David Gray responded that he was happy to ensure that this point was taken on board.

**ACTION:**  
**DAVID**  
**GRAY**

16. Cllr. Wright pointed out that with regard to the leaflets, it was important to learn of a date when the DfT proposed to distribute these to the residents.

David Gray again, acknowledged this point

**ACTION:**  
**DAVID**  
**GRAY**

## **PRESENTATION**

### **4060 BRITISH AIRWAYS COMPANY TRAVEL PLAN FOR HEATHROW**

1. Presentation from Dr. Paul Ellis, General Manager of Infrastructure Policy & Economic Regulation for British Airways about the company's Travel Plan, which will reduce car usage by staff, help improve air quality in the Heathrow area and reduce traffic congestion (*as enclosed*). The 'Towards T5' Company Travel Plan was tabled.

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

2. Iain Hope said that he was glad to note that British Airways supported AirTrack, which from a passenger point of view, was absolutely vital for communities in the area it would serve.

With regard to the London Underground and going back to the shifts in time on the starting of the train services, Iain asked if British Airways had made any progress on this. He was aware that this was of concern as the later starting time that the Mayor of London had decided on was not helpful in terms of getting staff into work on time to the airport at the weekend, which was conversely the busiest time.

Paul Ellis responded that progress had been made in this regard. Firstly, the initial proposal had been amended, so that there was only one day where the timing would alter and not two days. This was a good step forward. Secondly, the detailed schedules for that time had been amended into Heathrow, so they would not lose as much as the full hour. This was also a significant step forward. The disbenefits had shrunk.

3. John Gurney stated that it had been confirmed at the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on the morning of 25<sup>th</sup> July 2007, where a representative of London Underground was in attendance, that the planned time changes to the weekend train services had been scrapped.
4. John Gurney stated he thought that an aspect missing from the Travel Plan was the fact that the South-West of the airport in relation to bus services was terrible. The three services that did currently operate in that vicinity were routes 555/556/557. They also held the worst punctuality record. Out of all the buses that came into Heathrow, their reputation was disgraceful. These routes were supported by Surrey County Council. The fact that the services were so poor, deterred people from using them.

Previously, under the operation of London United, the services were good and widely used. The timing of the routes suited the operation of the staff and they were well supported.

London United lost the contract and it went to another operator. Since that time, the service had never recovered on those routes.

There was also another aspect omitted the Travel Plan. It was good that it had been seen that there was a need for cycle tracks. However, on the South-West side of the airport there was a big gap in relation to cycle tracks.

The cycle tracks stopped well short of Terminal 5. There was currently a gap and there did not appear to be an improvement on sorting this matter out.

It was understood that the stakeholders of T5 would be approaching Surrey County Council in relation to resolving this issue.

Paul Ellis responded that there were gaps still to be plugged in the Plan, but would encourage the various service providers to help.

5. The Chairman stated that it would be thought that the Heathrow Area Transport Forum Steering Group would be taking action to address this matter.
6. Geoff Pope commented that he was disappointed to hear that the new Tube Station at Terminal 5 would be disadvantaged and requested further information on this.

Also, looking at the issue from afar, it seemed odd that there would be so many private buses and so many public buses. It was thought that it would be more efficient if there was a joint operation where the public could use some of the British Airways buses, provided that the funding could be addressed.

Mr. Pope asked if it was thought there was scope to do this.

Paul Ellis replied that there was scope to do more and it was hoped this would be achieved. At one stage, British Airways did work with Transport for London on a particular bus service which BA had funded, which the public could use as well. It actually became far too expensive for British Airways to continue the service in this way.

It had to be taken in-house, but then came up against the problem of insurance constraints and security issues about taking other passengers on board British Airways' buses.

There were some practical issues, but British Airways were always looking for new ways and talking over with BAA about the on-airport bus services. It was hoped that there would be some fresh opportunities in due course.

7. Geoff Pope asked if British Airways were happy with the response received from Transport for London on proposed opportunities.

Paul Ellis replied 'no, not really'.

He said that with regard to the Tube, the issue was that the frequency was going to be cut. There would only be a train service every ten minutes into Terminal 5, which was a halving of the frequency in time and yet more passengers would actually be generated. British Airways were not happy about this aspect.

It was a complicated matter. Terminal 4 had to served as well as Terminal 5.

However, British Airways were very clear that there would be a much higher level of demand going into Terminal 5 than Terminal 4.

8. Mike Forster gave a BAA viewpoint on this matter. At present, it had only been possible to get 12 services running into Heathrow. The track arrangement was the old loop which came from Hatton Cross via Terminal 4 into the Central Terminal Area and back into the centre again, or from Hatton Cross into the centre and on to Terminal 5. There were only two routes.

The debate that had been ongoing was much like a 'Job of Solomon' to determine the split between those services. The view of the consultation with the whole community was not in universal agreement to the facilities being most equitable, in that everybody on airport had a minimum of ten minutes, except those in the centre would have five minutes.

There was a distortion of more trains through to T4 than to T5. However, BAA would try to get more trains through to Heathrow by working with TfL.

9. Cllr. Beer said that as a previous user of South-West region trains from Waterloo and all of the services outwards from there, all power to Paul Ellis and his colleagues in boosting AirTrack to get it up and running. He thought it would make an enormous difference.
10. John Gurney referred to the TfL report and the additional bus services required for T5. This was a mismatch. He believed it was not a good idea to have all buses running into the Central Terminal Area.

In relation to the fare policy within the Central Area on the Tube. It was very complicated. Ideally, it would be preferable to have it as part of the 'Free Zone' with all of the other services. Currently, the Tube was the 'oddball'. If not, perhaps a flat rate for moving around within the airport on the Tube could be set up.

Mike Forster responded that BAA had raised this point with LUL. He said that his view had always been very clear in that every time there was a vacant seat moving around this airport, BAA would need to find ways to get people onto it. A large number of empty seats could be seen going past on the transport at Heathrow every day. BAA needed to ensure that maximum use was made of the transport around Heathrow and the Underground was no exception.

BAA subsidised the Heathrow Express (HEX) free seats to make sure that people used those and sponsored the local buses and supported the free bus services around the airport.

BAA had looked at the proposals to provide its own bus service, but in reviewing the methods, it was thought better to support the local bus network, than a rival bus service.

11. Cllr. Turrell stated that he wished to add his support for AirTrack. Also, the extension of route 490 from Hatton Cross to Terminal 5 would prove beneficial in that regard.
12. Cllr. Khursheed spoke on a matter that he had previously raised at HACC meetings.

He said that whilst he was thankful to BAA for supporting free travel around the Heathrow area e.g. to Terminal 4 and extending to Terminal 5, when it came to London Underground and the Heathrow Express there was a huge problem.

If people were travelling on the trains through to the Terminals, right up to Hatton Cross, the passengers would need to pay £3.00. If a passenger wished to travel from Terminal 4 to Terminal 1, 2 and 3 on the London Underground, a single fare of £3.00 was chargeable. This matter should be taken up by BAA with London Underground.

Mike Forster responded that this matter had been spoken on with LUL since it was last raised.

13. Cllr. Roberts said that he re-iterated the comment made by Geoff Pope that if a solution could be found to a way of sharing the transport with others, it would be a great step forward.

There were probably more non-BAA employees on the South-side of the airport than there were BA employees. If the shuttle service from Staines could be made available to them, it would be of benefit and encourage more people to use the bus service.

At present, the journey from Staines to the southern part of Heathrow was a nightmare journey for the commuter which meant walking into Stanmore and boarding a bus which went 'all around the world'.

With regard to AirTrack, Runnymede BC was a supporter, working with other boroughs to help try to facilitate this service.

However, it must be recognised that the top end of the Runnymede borough was cut off by the train line that ran through Egham and by Virginia Water. There was a significant amount of investment that was needed for signalling to enable more trains to flow over the line without cutting the road system off for a greater length of time. This was one point of concern to Runnymede BC, if the road was cut in half for half-an-hour to one hour during peak times.

14. Paul Ellis stated that he would take the points made by the Members back to the AirTrack Forum.

As interest had been shown in the AirTrack scheme generally, it was thought that it might deserve, in due course, a presentation in its own right.

Mike Forster confirmed that he had arranged for a presentation to be made on AirTrack at the September HACC meeting.

The Chairman thanked Paul Ellis for his informative presentation.

#### **4061 AIR QUALITY - INTRODUCTION OF THE LOW EMISSION ZONE FOR GREATER LONDON**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.496**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

2. The Technical Adviser stated that this was one of the measures on the question of whether the Heathrow area would meet or not meet the European Union Standards for Air Quality. There had been some concern expressed recently that BAA might be too optimistic about it.

However, according to Mr. Livingstone's document, it was very optimistic that it would make a major improvement in this area.

As Members would be aware, with the M4, A4, A30 around the airport and the M25 not very far away (although out of Mr. Livingstone's area) there was an enormous amount of diesel engine heavy vehicles moving there. Whatever people thought of the merits of the scheme generally, it should have a major improvement effect on the Heathrow area, where the major roads will be controlled.

#### **4062 THE HEATHROW BIRD STRIKE WORKING GROUP**

1. Final report of the Working Group. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.497**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

#### **4063 ANNUAL MEETING OF CHAIRMEN OF AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES**

1. Report of meeting by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.498**) had been tabled and was noted.
2. The Chairman announced that the 2008 Annual Meeting of Chairmen of Airport Consultative Committee would be hosted by HACC, courtesy of BAA at Heathrow.
3. Iain Hope commented that he thought it was a first-class report that had been produced. There were many very important issues covered, which had been well summarised.

#### **4064 DEVELOPMENTS FOLLOWING SIGNING OF THE EU/US AIR TRANSPORT AGREEMENT**

1. Report of meeting by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.499**) had been tabled and was noted.

#### **4065 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2007 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.
2. Andy Hull spoke on behalf of the Chairman of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee Philip Carlisle, with regard to a matter that had been previously raised at HACC relating to the issuing of Airside ID passes for several members of the PSSC.

The reducing number and frequency of change of BAA management has resulted in the reduction of the number of available authorised signatories for ID passes.

It was appreciated that the Committee were not the only people affected and that the remaining authorised signatories were obviously under pressure.

Although the matter had previously been addressed by Ben Morton, there was still a problem in getting the ID passes signed off.

Ben Morton responded by asking the Secretary if it was not correct that the problem as he understood it related to character references.

The Secretary explained that the character references process had been resolved with BSC in Glasgow. The outstanding problem revolved around the fact that the referencing authorised signatory from HR at Heathrow assigned to the Committee, had now left BAA and no replacement had been found to continue the function in his stead.

Ben Morton said that he would follow this matter up.

**ACTION:**  
**BEN**  
**MORTON**

#### **4066 NTK WORKING GROUP**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2007 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.
2. The DfT had just published the report and maps of the Noise Contours 2006 for Heathrow Airport, too late for reporting at this meeting. Members who wish to view the report prior to the September meeting of HACC, can access it on the Department's website -  
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/aviation/environmentalissues/nec/secnoise06/pdfnoiseheath06>

#### **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

##### **4067 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT**

1. LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for Quarter 1 (January-March 2007) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

##### **4068 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

1. Planning applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for June and July 2007 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

##### **4069 AVIATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT – NEW WEB SITE LAUNCHED**

1. A new global cross-industry initiative that is supported and financed by the commercial aviation industry had opened at [www.enviro.aero](http://www.enviro.aero). Its purpose is stated to be to provide clear information about flying and the environment and what is being done to limit the impact of aviation. The initiative has been developed under the umbrella of the Air Transport Action Group, which is sponsored by IATA. Members may find it a useful source of information.

##### **4070 NEWS RELEASES**

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

##### **4071 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Virginia Godfrey stated that it was very disappointing to note that the BAA Managing Director, Mark Bullock, was not in attendance for the entire HACC meeting, except briefly to *address* the Members. It was her understanding that the Committee was set up statutorily for informed discussion and yet the Members were *addressed* for a few minutes.

It was thought appropriate that the Members representing local authorities and other organisations should be able to discuss and consult and that the operator (BAA) should be able to listen to their concerns and not merely address the Committee. The issue of the Managing Director not being in attendance for the whole meeting had been raised before.

A request was made that the wording on the Agenda should state the Managing Director will 'discuss' matters with the Committee and not 'address' the Committee. This was acknowledged.

2. Margaret Majumdar supported the comments made by Virginia Godfrey. Whilst it was appreciated that Mr. Bullock was extremely busy, this was also the case for everybody else. The HACC meetings were the only opportunity that the Members had around the airport to discuss noise issues. It was extremely important the Managing Director should be in attendance for the whole meeting.

The Chairman responded that he was sure that both Ben Morton and Mike Forster would take the comments on board, but events at Heathrow had been dreadfully hectic for the last few months, in addition to the Chief Executive resigning at the airport during the last few weeks.

The Chairman said that during his appointed time with the Committee, there had been five Managing Directors and each successive MD's tenure had been shorter than their predecessor's.

The point made by Virginia and Margaret was understood as it used to be very helpful to have the dialogue throughout the meeting. It was hoped that perhaps once events settle down at the airport, the attendance of the Managing Director for the entire HACC meeting, could be resumed.

3. Mike Forster commented that the dialogue at HACC meetings was such that the operational issues affecting 'today' would be covered by himself and 'future plans' covered by Mark Bullock.

With Tony Douglas (former CAA Chief Executive) leaving BAA, there was a hiatus, which it was important for BAA to address.

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

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

**WEDNESDAY 26th SEPTEMBER 2007**

