

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 26th September 2007 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Ian Potts	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Paul Buttivant	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Shirley Fisher (Deputy)	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Peter de Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Martin Elengorn	-	LB Richmond on Thames
Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy)	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Christopher Turrell	-	Bracknell Forest BC
Professor Moreton Moore (Deputy)	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Julia Long	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Dev Dhillon	-	South Bucks District Council
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos	-	Surrey County Council
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Lynette Braithwaite	-	AUC
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Philip Carlisle	-	GTMC
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Colin Mitchell	-	Independent
Mako Mochizuki	-	Independent

OTHERS

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

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Sarah Porretta	-	Community Relations Manager
representing Ben Morton	-	Director of Communications
Mike Forster	-	Strategy & Development Director

PRESENTERS

Paul Whitfield	-	Managing Director, dot2dot
Karen Kyle	-	Head of HM Immigration & Border Control
Mike Noakes	-	General Manager, Rail Projects

CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

1. Ben Morton (BAA Director of Communications), Cllr. Nicholas Botterill (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Rob Gibson (LAANC), Cllr. Mohammed Khursheed (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. John Oswell (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Felicity Barwood (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Christopher Wright (London Councils), Cllr. Patrick Roberts (Runnymede BC), Cllr. David Rowlands (Bucks County Council), Cllr. George Trussler (Spelthorne BC), Cllr. Philip Bicknell (RB Windsor & Maidenhead), Mike Walsh (Independent), Susan Laurie (Independent), John Gurney (TUC), Geoff Pope (London Assembly), Brian Yates (Consumers' Association), Frank Wingate (Future Heathrow).

2. The Chairman stated that it was customary to hold the HACC Seminar in December of each year, followed by the Annual Dinner, hosted by BAA. However, this year it was suggested that a short Business Meeting was held in the late-morning, after the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting, commencing at 11.30 a.m. This would be followed by a sit-down Lunch, hosted by BAA, in place of the Dinner. It was then proposed that the afternoon would be devoted to undertaking a major tour of Terminal 5. The site of Terminal 2 would also be looked at for the proposed Heathrow East development. The day would close by 4.30 p.m. – 5.00 p.m.

It had not been convenient for the T5 tour to take place at the September meeting as originally planned, as it was still a hard-hat site with hard shoes required.

The Chairman asked if this proposal commended itself to the Members.

The Members agreed

4072 NATIONAL EXPRESS DOT2DOT SERVICE

1. The Chairman introduced Paul Whitfield, Managing Director of **National Express dot2dot** who gave a general update on the new airport transfer service from Heathrow and Gatwick to Central London. A brochure outlining the objectives of the service was circulated to the Members for information. A vehicle had been made available for members of the PSSC to view, outside Heathrow Point West.

Mr. Whitfield explained that National Express had purchased Hotelink in April 2007 and proposed major improvements to the service.

There would be a service leaving Central London and also Heathrow Airport at approximately five-minute intervals, with a min. 15/20 minutes to/from each of three areas in the City.

When Terminal 5 opens, there will be a separate service.

There would be reduced time spent on the vehicle, with more zoning of hotels/geographies. The 10-12 seater vehicles would undertake fewer pick-ups. There would be no more than 4 pick-ups/drop-offs per journey.

The service was registered as a bus route and could therefore use the bus lanes to avoid traffic congestion.

The latest booking and logistics technology would be used at the airport, allowing more staff to concentrate on customer service. Live booking information would be available to give a virtually paper-free environment.

Significant investment had been made in customer service training for all functions of drivers, airport staff and reservations staff.

Very careful recruitment had been undertaken with drivers appointed who had a good attitude and had been trained to drive the vehicles. There would be more customer service staff at the airport.

Regular customer surveys to refine the offer would be made. Each customer who submitted their e-mail address would receive a short customer service questionnaire after each journey.

Including Hotelink's current vehicles, there would be 76 in the fleet by December 2007. As there were only 10 or 12 seats in the new vehicles, they would have three different configurations, wider leather seats and more leg room (34 inch seat pitch).

Much investment had also been made in IT and the website. A new reservation and control system had been installed, tried and tested in this market in the US and enhancement for the UK market.

The in-vehicle control equipment had been significantly enhanced. This would enable good communications between control and drivers, with silent communications through touch screen for drivers and live traffic information to avoid delays. More accurate GPS tracking of vehicle locations would be possible, with satellite navigation for optimal routing, passenger information displays and large rear facing screens for messaging to passengers.

The pricing for the dot2dot National Express service from Heathrow was proposed at:-

Single ticket @ £22.00 - Return ticket @ £35.00

The pricing for the dot2dot National Express service from Gatwick was proposed at:-

Single ticket @ £24.00 - Return ticket @ £40.00

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

2. The Chairman asked if dot2dot was a pre-booked service.

Mr. Whitfield replied that this was not a pre-booked service. A passenger could arrive at the desk to request the service.

3. Paul Ellis said that the service was an interesting innovation, which was welcomed, but questioned where the baggage would be placed. He asked if a separate presentation could be made to the airlines on the new service.

Paul Whitfield agreed to this request to make a presentation to the airlines.
With regard to the storage of baggage, there would be a separate area allocated to the rear of the vehicle, although there would be a £3.00 charge for excess baggage.

4. The Chairman asked if it was thought that the black cab would be put out of business with the introduction of the new service.

Mr. Whitfield replied that this was unlikely.

4073 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1. (a) The Minutes of the meeting held on 25th July 2007 were agreed.

4074 MATTERS ARISING

1. (a) **Minute 4053 – Request presence of Alistair Duff, Chairman of Heathrow Area Transport Forum.**
2. Sarah Porretta confirmed that Ben Morton had tried to make contact with Alistair Duff on this matter, but he was currently on annual leave.
This request would be carried forward.

ACTION:
BEN
MORTON

3. Cllr. Beer asked if it was possible for a list of members of the Heathrow Area Transport Forum to be provided, as a point of contact.

The Chairman said that a list of the membership of the Bus & Coach Working Group could be circulated with the minutes.

ACTION:
SECRETARIAT

1. (b) **Minute 4053 – Arrange separate meetings for Cllr. Patrick Roberts and John Gurney re: traffic congestion due to Control Posts.**
2. Sarah Porretta confirmed that a meeting was held between John Gurney and Nick Dent. A separate meeting had yet to be set up with Cllr. Patrick Roberts.

(Secretary's Note): Cllr. Roberts had also confirmed that John Gurney did attend the meeting that had been set up to discuss this matter, but he was unable to attend himself and had to send Apologies. However, receipt was still awaited for a copy of the BAA report on future plans.

A request was therefore made if the agenda item could be brought forward again at the December HACC meeting, together with the report.

ACTION:
SECRETARIAT

1. (c) **Minute 4053 – AirTrack Meeting.**
2. The Chairman confirmed that this would be dealt with under Agenda Item 8.

1. (d) **Minute 4053 – T5 Live Volunteers Recruitment Campaign Telephone Number.**

2. The Chairman commented that he had been told that the members of the PSSC in particular, were not receiving any priority on this matter.

Sarah Porretta confirmed that the Volunteer Hotline Telephone No: to register interest for the T5 Proving Trials was 020 8745 5755 (Mon-Fri 08.30 hrs. – 17.30 hrs.).

3. Susan Parsons explained that both herself and Susan Laurie had signed up to undertake the trials on 4th October 2007. However, they had received an e-mail in response, to inform them that they had been short-listed. It was thought that this was pointless. It would be nice for the members of the PSSC to experience this. It was understood that one other member of the Committee had been told that they ‘were not required’.
4. Andy Hull explained that he had also signed up on the website in his own right, and had not received a response. However, as members of the PSSC, they were promised that they would be invited separately, to take part in that exercise.
5. Cllr. Potts stated that originally, the Committee had been told that everyone on HACC would be invited to take part in the T5 Proving Trials.

More importantly, there was a world of difference in the situation between seeing a crowd of people who were actual passengers, as opposed to a crowd who were being conducted around the terminal. The representatives of the Committee would like to get to see as potential passengers, the systems put in place.

Sarah Porretta suggested that for those Members who wished to participate in the T5 Proving Trials, if they could put their names forward to the Secretary this could be actioned. This was agreed.

ACTION:
SECRETARIAT

1. (e) **Minute 4054 – DfT Noise Contours re: presentation and hard copy of contours requested.**

2. David Gray had taken this request back to the office of the DfT. It was understood that one hard copy of the 2006 Noise Contours was supplied to the Secretariat. He had been advised that the standard format was to direct people to the website.

The Chairman said that he understood that there was very little change in the noise contours year-on-year.

David Gray responded that this was correct.

The Chairman suggested that any member with a keen interest in the noise contours, could be provided with a copy by the Secretariat.

Both Virginia Godfrey and Margaret Majumdar requested a hard copy of the document.

ACTION:
SECRETARIAT

1. (f) **Minute 4056 – BAA Property Market Support Bond Scheme – number of household applicants.**
2. The Chairman read from a Statement issued by BAA *'there was 665 residential properties and 60 commercial properties within the Property Market Support Bond Scheme boundary. All are eligible to apply, so long as the rateable value as at 2000 is less than £24,600. To date, BAA Heathrow has received significant enquiries and applications for the Scheme. They do not publish exact numbers'*.
3. Margaret Majumdar stated that there was still no mention of what would happen to the Primary School in Sipson. The LB Hillingdon would need to be compensated for this valuable building site.

Mike Forster replied that BAA would look into this matter.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

1. (g) **Minute 4059 – PSDH – Public Consultation – presentation at HACC Annual Seminar requested.**
2. The Chairman asked David Gray if a date was yet known for the publication of the consultation.

David Gray responded that this matter would be covered under Agenda Item 13. (Minute 4084).

1. (h) **Minute 4059 – Leaflet awareness distribution for LB Ealing residents re: PSDH Public Consultation.**
2. David Gray responded that this matter would be covered under Agenda Item 13. (Minute 4084).

1. (j) **Minute 4065 – Authorised Signatories for Airside ID Passes.**

2. The Secretary confirmed that she continued to pursue this matter to a satisfactory conclusion.

ACTION:
SECRETARIAT

4075 NIGHT FLIGHTS AT HEATHROW – Disregards

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.502**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. A reply had been received from the Minister for Aviation, Mr. Jim Fitzpatrick, in response to the letter sent to the Secretary of State on behalf of the Committee in July 2007.
2. Cllr. Peter de Vic Carey referred to paragraph 5 of the Report, where it had stated that Mr. Fitzpatrick had referred to the 'disregard' procedures and the reasons for authorising them and that any such aircraft flights are kept to a '*minimum*'. He asked what this actually meant.

The Chairman suggested that a letter could be sent to Jim Fitzpatrick MP to ask what his idea of a *'minimum'* actually was.

3. Margaret Majumdar asked if the question could also be asked in the letter if Mr. Fitzpatrick would be considering all the 'disregards' or even some of them, against the next Quota period.
4. The Technical Adviser referred to the DFT Surface Access Stakeholder Meeting which was held on 12th September 2007. The Chairman of that Group announced that when the consultation was actually produced, that the Ministers would travel about to talk to different Groups, e.g. HACC.

A bid had been put in to get the Aviation Minister Jim Fitzpatrick MP to come and talk to the Committee when he was able to do so. The 5th December HACC meeting was suggested as an appropriate time.

As to whether the consultation would be launched by that time and whether the Minister was also available was not yet known.

5. The Chairman agreed that the Committee would try to achieve the presence of the Aviation Minister to speak after the luncheon at the 5th December HACC meeting.

If this was not possible, a further letter would be sent to him to address the two points raised by the Members. This was agreed.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

6. Paul Ellis said that it was important to note that the Quota limits were set with an expectation that there would be 'disregards' for additional flights in exceptional circumstances. It would unbalance the settlement if they were to move beyond that. It was not expected that the basic allowance would be increased.

In response the Chairman said that there had been a concern shown that on one or two occasions, there seemed to be a sizeable number of flights over and above the usual 'disregards'.

7. Margaret Majumdar commented that about a month ago, a circulation had been received which had charts of usage of aircraft movement against the Quota. It had shown that 98% was being used and that the rest were 'disregards' within the Quota. Therefore, it did not tally up with the statement that Paul Ellis had made.

Paul Ellis responded that he had said that the Quota was set with an expectation that there would be 'disregards' in exceptional circumstances.

8. David Gray commented that he was unable to add anything further to that which the Minister had said on the subject in his letter, except for the fact that the regime was considered in great detail and that there were no plans at present to review the Quota before the next formal review.

4076 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

1. There were no matters to report against this Agenda item.

4077 COMMENTARY FROM THE MANAGING DIRECTOR, BAA HEATHROW

1. (a) Mr Mark Bullock, Managing Director of Heathrow, was unable to attend the meeting. In his absence, Mike Forster gave an update to the Committee.

In terms of passenger flow, August was up 6.5% over previous years. This was the first August for some years, when there was not a significant interruption to the operations. In terms of the **operational performance**, the efforts that had been put in, despite the Press campaign that had been ongoing, the impact of 500 extra guards that had been trained and put into the operation, with nine extra lanes, was that in relation to security key performance, BAA was beginning to see an improvement. 91% of the time queues for July and August were under ten minutes.

BAA had published a clear aim to get the queue level controlled, with 95% being under five minutes. Retail space was being taken out and extra lanes were being put in, together with extra guards. BAA were making sure that this worked well not only for security, but transfers, control posts and staff. There was a major effort to get performance in this area up. Once a level of performance had been reached that BAA felt they were comfortable with, they would roll this out across the whole of the passenger journey to make sure that the performance worked properly.

No one at Heathrow was complacent. There had been marked improvements and recognition had been received for these.

In relation to the organisation, there had been some **organisational changes**. Tony Douglas, BAA Divisional Director and Heathrow Chief Executive had left the company to take up the role of Chief Operating Officer at Laing O'Rourke. BAA would ensure that the organisational structure of Heathrow was clear. Mr. Forster said that both he and Mark Bullock were in the process of discussing how they would manage the transition as it moved forward.

It was suggested that a full update was given to the Members at the next HACC meeting.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

BAA were in the middle of the Price Review by **The Competition Commission**. There were two Reviews running concurrently. The Price Review was running slightly ahead of the Structural Review. The Competition Commission would be responding on the Price Review at the end of September, back to the CAA. The CAA would then consider their report and determine their pricing structure for the next year.

With regard to **Security**, BAA would shortly be making announcements about the investment of new technology. The new generation of Archway Metal Detectors would be brought in. New X-Ray equipment was currently being trialled, which would also be rolled out.

BAA were also working very closely with the DfT on the removal of the one bag restriction policy. A trial was running in the Flight Connection Centre (FCC) for transfer passengers. It was hoped to roll this out as soon as possible across the terminals.

BAA were conscious that this had caused confusion for the passengers, who could fly in to the airport with two bags, but on transferring, could only essentially fly back out with one bag.

Work was also being undertaken at Heathrow on **Real Time Communications**. BAA wished to not only shorten the queues, but inform the passengers if there was a long queue by using LCD screens, which had been installed in various locations around ticket presentation and central search areas.

In August, a **Climate Camp** was held by a group of environmental activists who occupied a field in Sipson. There was a great Press coverage of the event at this time. However, it was important to note that during the week of Climate Camp, BAA had 1.5 million passenger who flew through Heathrow, none of whom had been disrupted. This was due to the significant effort by the operational staff to make sure that it was properly managed, and the security or safety of passengers and staff was not jeopardised.

On Monday 24th September 2007, the keys were formally handed over from the builders to the operators for **Terminal 5**. The T5 Proving Trials had commenced, the response to which had been very positive.

BAA were still on track that they would be opening a fully operational terminal with fully trained staff on time.

BAA were proud that the Health & Safety record for the project had been achieved with a million man-hours worked, without a reportable accident for the tenth time. Two million consecutive man-hours had been worked and with a million man-hours currently on the clock, it was hoped that the Terminal 5 project would be completed with three million man-hours worked without a reportable accident. T5 had become a benchmark in the construction industry for its safety achievement for a project that large.

The Piccadilly Line Terminal 5 extension was also handed over to London Underground in July 2007. The Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone took this on behalf of Transport for London (TfL). Again, this project was on time and on budget, which was a major milestone.

Ruth Kelly, Transport Secretary, visited Heathrow in her new role in August. She was able to take an in-depth look at all of the elements that were currently ongoing in the operations regarding security and acknowledged the improvements that had been made. in the operations.

The Chairman thanked Mike Forster for the update.

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.

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

3. Roger Wiltshire referred to the ongoing trial of removal of the one bag policy in the Flight Connection Centre (FCC) transfer area. He asked that if the security branch of the DfT gave approval to sign this off within the next two weeks, how long would it take before it was rolled out to all the transfer areas across the airport.

Mike Forster replied that he was unable to provide an accurate answer to this query. Heathrow and the transfer area was a priority and it was hoped to roll this out in November 2007. However, a full report would be obtained with a date.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

4. Cllr. Ian Potts referred to Climate Camp. He said that either the BAA Injunction was very OTT or the Press coverage was atrocious. According to the reports heard, members of the National Trust could be banned from visiting Heathrow Airport. Certainly the impression given to the public as a whole, was that BAA were trying to stop people accessing their natural rights. It came over very badly.

It was also pointed out that the Internship Programme with the Thames Valley University as detailed in the report was not in Brentford, but Ealing.

Mr. Forster acknowledged this point for future reference.

In relation to the Climate Camp, Mike Forster said that BAA were faced with a very difficult situation. The important aspect was the security and safety of the passengers and staff, which the Police had handled. The publicity was very unfortunate. However, the environmental activists were allowed to make their point and the passengers were able to travel without disruption.

5. Cllr. Beer referred to the security arrangements at Heathrow. As Chairman of LAANC (Local Authorities' Aircraft Noise Council) he said that although he had no personal knowledge of the fact, a comment was widely made and supported by his members that the Security staff were very rude and poorly trained at Heathrow, resulting in a poor customer experience. People were far too officious. This should be recorded.

The Chairman responded that this matter had been debated at the last two meetings. BAA were doing everything in their power to try improve the situation.

6. Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey commented that Ken Livingstone was quoted as saying that 'Heathrow shamed the Capital' and that using it was a notorious hassle. He asked if the airport would be transformed with the opening of Terminal 5.

Mike Forster replied that there were some operational improvements that BAA had been making, which would clearly help the culture of passenger services. However, that would not be sufficient in itself. The airport had a set of infrastructures which were designed for a capacity of 45-50 million passengers. Heathrow was short on terminal and runway capacity.

The result was that at peak times, the terminals were extremely crowded. If there was any backlog on the system, it took a very long time to recover, due to the lack of runway capacity.

In its own right, Terminal 5 would be a very welcome addition to Heathrow, taking a 35 million passenger capacity. It would provide a great passenger experience and an operating environment for the airport.

It has a very important second element, which was the key to unlock the door to the refurbishment for the rest of Heathrow. As passengers were moved into T5, this would clear space for a refurbished T3 and T4. Space would also be created when T2 closed down and building work started to the East of the airport.

It was the aim of BAA that by 2012, two-thirds of passengers would go through facilities that were not currently there today and that world-class facilities would stand shoulder-to-shoulder with any across the world.

In terms of terminal capacity, BAA had a plan, but now needed the Competition Commission to regulate a settlement which allowed BAA to implement that plan. In terms of the runway capacity, the DfT should comment on this aspect.

4078 AIRCRAFT ENGINE PROBLEM DISRUPTS FLIGHTS AT HEATHROW

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.503**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Technical Adviser informed the Members that this item had been raised by Rob Gibson, representing LAANC. However, as he was unable to attend the meeting, he would ask a fellow LB Hounslow to speak on his behalf.

Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey said that the LB Hounslow would like to know why the runway was closed for two hours on 31st August 2007, causing much disruption and yet nobody had seemed to have heard anything about it, except for the BBC London website report.

He asked if there was in fact, much debris on the runway. It was understood that the aircraft, a Boeing 767-300ER of Royal Brunei Airlines, registration V8-RBG, had an engine problem on departure which had resulted in debris being left on the runway and the return of the aircraft to Heathrow, where it disembarked 202 passengers.

Mike Forster summarised, that essentially, there was an engine problem shortly after take-off, which using the jet-stream blew sections of the turbine metal blades back onto the runway in a fan shape. Given instances where foreign debris had caused problems with subsequent aeroplanes, there had to be a thorough search of the runway to make sure that all of the elements had been found. It did not cause any problems, as the aeroplane certainly landed safely.

Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey again asked how much debris was in fact on the runway, e.g. a small pile.

Mr. Forster confirmed that there were relatively lots of small bits of turbine blades, which had blown back onto a large area, because the aeroplane had already taken off.

4079 AIRTRACK

1. Presentation by Mike Noakes, General Manager, Rail Projects (*enclosed*).
An update on Crossrail was also given.

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

2. Professor Morton Moore asked how many extra trains would be passing through Egham. There were a large number of level crossings which were often down. It was of concern if traffic congestion would be created. Would consideration be given to building bridges in the vicinity.

Mike Noakes replied that these level crossings, together with buildings and bridges would be considered by Network Rail.

3. Mako Mochizuki asked the journey time from Paddington-T4 on Heathrow Connect, also the transfer time from T4 to T5.

Mike Noakes confirmed that the journey time from Paddington to T4 was 27 minutes. However, the transfer time from T4 to T5 was not known.

Mike Forster commented that in terms of Landside transfers from T4 to T5 the number would be relatively small.

4. Cllr. Grant stated that the level crossings at Runnymede would also need to be taken into account. With the proposal for a new railway station at Staines, she asked how many extra car park spaces would be available.

Mike Noakes replied that this was not yet known. It was currently being worked on.

5. Keith Harlow stated that if the Crossrail plan was to run four trains per hour into T4, he asked if it was possible from next year, to run four trains per hour for Heathrow Connect trains into T4, rather than the planned two.

Mike Noakes stated that this would not be possible. A major part of the Crossrail work on the Great Western main line was to increase the capacity of Airport Junction.

The Airport Junction where it turns off, was really built to connect the main line to Heathrow. The fast service runs on the main line. The relief line is where Crossrail would run. It was not possible to run more than two trains per hour. It was not possible to get any more through.

6. Andy Hull asked, that assuming all the new schemes go ahead, what the frequency of trains through the Central Area would be, excluding the London Underground service.

Mike Noakes confirmed that it would be eight trains per hour. The Airtrack service, as planned at the moment, would stop at Terminal 5. There would four heavy rail trains in each direction and twelve Piccadilly Line trains, a total of twenty trains.

7. Cllr. Turrell asked if it was known the times of the first and last trains, and if the frequency on Sunday would be the same as the other days.

Mike Noakes replied that with regard to the first and last trains, it was hoped to get the timetable running, at least as early as the current train service e.g. 4.50 a.m. AirTrack were working with the airport operator on this matter, with a view to try to maximise that. It was thought that the same service would run on a Sunday. Network Rail had a big project across the whole country to try to get a seven-day timetable up and running, and change the way that the maintenance was carried out over the next five years.

It was recognised that a Sunday at the airport was as important as the rest of the week.

8. Cllr. Elengorn stated that LB Richmond welcomed AirTrack. However, the same principle applied in relation to level crossings at Sheen and Mortlake Stations. He also asked if the soon to be vacated Eurostar platforms at Waterloo Station would be used for AirTrack.

Mr. Noakes replied that the platforms might not be used. Again, this matter was currently being investigated by Network Rail. There was another ongoing project that did not rely on the use of Eurostar platforms.

9. Cllr. Saliagopoulos said that she found it strange to note, that Mr. Noakes knew the train times and where they would be running on the lines, but not where all the vehicles would be able to park at Staines Station, once the new services were up and running.

Mike Noakes replied that the reason that he could answer the question on train times, was because it was to a specification input. The output was to help people to get to the station.

10. Paul Ellis said that he welcomed the AirTrack presentation. From the perspective of airline staff and people working at the airport, a very good public transport service was essential into the area. People should be encouraged to travel to Heathrow by train. It was hoped that this would be an opportunity to develop the regeneration of a whole new area being served. such as some of the less well-off areas of South Central London to enable them to draw some additional strength from this. It would be good if this was up and running before the Olympics in 2012.

11. Cllr. Peter de Vic Carey pointed out that whilst AirTrack had enormous support, it was thought that it would not be possible to get on a train at Heathrow as it would be too crowded with passengers from Terminal 5, as would the Piccadilly line train.

Mike Noakes explained that it was proposed to run the maximum number of trains to accommodate the capacity of passengers.

4080 OPERATIONS OF THE BORDER CONTROL AND IMMIGRATION AGENCY AT HEATHROW

1. Karen Kyle, Head of HM Border & Immigration Control gave a general update on the initiatives and changes to the Agency's operations at Heathrow, including the IRIS Recognition Immigration System, MySense trials and introduction of uniformed staff (*enclosed*).

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

2. Iain Hope referred to the queue management he had witnessed on the first floor at Security in Terminal 1 Departures at 12 noon on the day of the HACC meeting. The signage had been improved. Although there were hardly any passengers, there was an extraordinary chicane of impeding people trying to reach the desk. He asked if it was the responsibility of HM Immigration & Border Control to ensure that staff are available to assist people. Several people had looked on astonished.

Karen Kyle agreed that HM Immigration & Border Control did try to be flexible regarding chicanes so that people are accommodated. Staff should have been there to alter that chicane, so that such a situation did not arise.

3. Philip Carlisle pointed out that Departures was the responsibility of BAA Security. Arrivals was the responsibility of HM Immigration & Border Control.

4. Iain Hope asked Mike Forster if this matter could be addressed. This was agreed.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

5. Philip Carlisle spoke as the Chairman of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee. He said that queue management and passenger expectation was of concern. It was one matter to show people how long they were waiting; but the aim was not to have passengers waiting at all. There were two elements to this, both connected to resources. Firstly, BAA had announced several months ago that its target for Security queues, the activity for which it was suggested was more complicated and time consuming than the general Passport scan (relevant to EU passengers), was five minutes maximum for 95% of the time.

It was indicated from the presentation given that the HM Immigration SLA target was fifteen minutes. It was thought that this was totally unacceptable as an SLA.

Mr. Carlisle said that one of the complaints he had heard of on several occasions, partly because HM Immigration were conducting a more thorough examination of the EU Passport, was a queue where there did not need to be a queue. It was thought that the answer to this was that more people were needed for this job.

A further comment was made on the IRIS Recognition Immigration System. Many people had signed up to use the facility, although at times, the Offices for signing up were not always open nor manned for the advertised hours. However, once people were signed up, coming through a single piece of technology, where it was found that sometimes, the queue was longer than the normal Passport queue. It was suspected that this could be due in part, to people becoming familiar with using the kit, partly because the machines were under resourced, and partly because many people were trying to use it.

It was suggested that two or three automated Channels were needed soon to eradicate this problem. It was hoped that this aspect would resolve the SLA expectation.

It was thought that the organisation should consider more resources. Whilst passengers might be accepting the situation today, once BAA achieved their target, the question would be asked why they were waiting at HM Immigration & Border Control.

6. Keith Harlow commented that he was a great supporter of the IRIS Recognition Immigration System. He had enrolled when the scheme was first launched and it was definitely a fast track way of getting back into the country. However, now there were 150,000 people signed up to this scheme, it was definitely a slow track element. The queues were longer than those at the normal Passport Control.
7. Professor Moreton Moore stated that he believed that the word 'Passports' was much the same in many major languages. However, it was not thought that the word 'Border' was universal. He asked if the word 'Border' would be written up in a number of major languages.

Karen Kyle responded that there were no plans to do this. The word 'Passports' will still remain, with signs around the terminals indicating to passengers to have their Passports ready for examination.

In terms of UK Border signs, there was no facility planned to put this up in many other languages. If this was done, the difficulty would be that this would distract from the actual sign and the message that they wished to get across to the passengers. However, this suggestion would be taken away for consideration.

8. Paul Ellis stated that from the clear presentation, he understood the political imperatives to display tight Border controls. However, it should be ensured that a good experience was given to the passengers with queue management and no waiting. It needed more resource. This should be part of the aspiration.

There had recently been a massive rise in customer complaints about the UK Border Service, particularly from EU passengers who had waited for more than an hour for clearance when there was meant to be free movement in the EU. People do not expect that. Whilst it was right that it should continue to be a central feature that tight, proper controls are in place, if the UK Border Service needs further resources, this matter should be addressed.

With regard to the IRIS Recognition Immigration System, this was new technology on trial. Passengers need to get used to the system and be helped through by staff, when initially using it, once registered.

9. In response to Cllr. Elengorn, Karen Kyle replied that the question of when a person physically entered the boundary of the UK had been raised and covered previously within the Home Office. The system represented the fact that people are entering the UK in terms of Passport Control. At that point, they are being granted entry into the UK.
10. Susan Parsons stated that following on from the comments made by Paul Ellis,

the EU now comprised 27 Member States. Norway and Switzerland were also allowed to come through. This meant that the number trying to get through a fairly small Channel, was much higher than it used to be in the past.

From experience, the queues for the EU could be very, very long, whereas the queues for the non-EU could be very short. There did not seem to be mass switching of Officers, manning the non-EU stations to the EU. It was thought that matter should be addressed.

The first impression for many people, which stated '*EU Border Welcome to Britain*', was a very poor one. This was a great shame. However, by and large, the HM Immigration Border & Control Service was trying to do a good job in difficult circumstances, but it did need better resourcing.

11. Roger Wiltshire stated that he endorsed that which Paul Ellis had said in relation to extra resourcing being needed to address the length of the queues, and the comment from Susan Parsons, that the wrong impression was gained by visitors when they entered the UK. We should learn from the US process experience, who had discovered how to achieve a good impression to their visitors.

Mr. Wiltshire asked if the SLAs were fifteen minutes waiting time, how were the queues handled.

Karen Kyle responded that HM Immigration & Border Control were reaching their standards of 90% across all four terminals.

12. Andy Hull referred to the differential between EU Passports and Non-EU Passports. which it was understood was the designation of the lanes in existence. Many countries use 'Non EU Passports' and 'All Other Passports' so that if there was no queue of non-EU passengers trying to get in to the country, it was possible to use either Channel. He asked if that was the case in the UK, or was it was a matter of sticking to the EU lane.

Karen Kyle replied that the reason that passengers were channelled into EU and Non-EU Channels was because the Non-EU passengers took longer to process. As an EU passenger, they could pass through the Non-EU Channel, but a Non-EU Passport holder could not go through the EU Channel.

It was also pointed out that if, as a EU National, a person was travelling with a Non-EU National member of their family, it was fine to use the same Channel.

13. Karen Kyle gave a general assurance about resources. It was a complicated matter. It was not solely a question of having staff at the desk, It was also a question of the number of desks. There were infrastructure limitations in terms of the size of the Immigration Halls. It was also a case of predicting the passenger flow with BAA at early stages. HM Immigration & Border Control did resource around predicted schedules. It was also a case of getting better about changes.

The Chairman thanked Karen Kyle for the informative presentation.

14. Paul Ellis suggested that the points made should be communicated to the Cabinet Office who were currently carrying out a Review, to say that the Committee did not accept the times that were allocated. This was agreed.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

4081 PASSENGER EXPERIENCE OF AIR TRAVEL: HOUSE OF COMMONS TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.500**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. (*Also for PSSC*).
2. The Chairman said that the Committee could if they wished, make Recommendations to Government.
3. The Technical Adviser said that the section on Taxis had been dealt with in some detail at the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee on the morning of the 26th September 2007. There was a general concern amongst the members that the House of Commons Transport Committee had not taken on board some of the points that they had made.

Service Level Quality referred to in the report was a major feature of the work of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee. It summarised some of the points that the Transport Committee had picked up about it.

The Transport Committee Report was addressed to the Government, which had to prepare a response. There was still time for the Committee to write to make any points, which it was hoped they would take account of. In particular, the first Recommendation, that there was a need to sort out the taxi question, which had been under debate for a very long time.

Paragraphs 25 and 26 of the Appendix dealt with the Disability Discrimination Act. The Passengers Services Sub-Committee had received a presentation from BAA about the steps they were taking to implement the requirements, to help people who were handicapped or disabled. There was a reference in the Transport Committee Report to baggage problems with airlines and in particular, to those which British Airways had been experiencing at Heathrow.

One of the issues that had previously been raised at the PSSC meeting, which promoted much debate was the amount of space that airports dedicated to retail and the amount of money they made from this. It did point to BAA being one of the largest commercial landlords in the UK. A summary of this was included in Paragraph 14 & 15 of the Appendix.

4. Philip Carlisle said that on behalf of the PSSC, in relation to the Taxi debate, he supported the Technical Adviser's Recommendation. Whether a physical solution in the could be found in the form of a local single local journey taxi rank, licensed to undertake such work, linked to the Central Bus Station had yet to be determined, but it had been recommended previously by the members of the PSSC.

5. Cllr. Potts referred to the section on AirTrack and Crossrail in the Appendix. It was hoped that these schemes would be passed through Parliament, but it had been rumoured that the funding might not be available.
6. Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey stated that Heathrow Airport was a thoroughly unpleasant place to be in terms of arriving at and departing from, with long queues at Security.

He said that he would like the Committee to receive some form of note of what the passengers' objections were and the fact that their baggage was going around the world and not ending up with them.

The Chairman responded that the Chief Executive of BAA, Stephen Nelson, was on record as saying that 'things were not right at Heathrow.' They accepted that there were many failings, but that they are being put right dramatically and that within a couple of years it would be a totally different place, working efficiently with absolutely no room for complaint.

7. The Chairman said that he would like the Taxi point addressed by the Committee. The suggestion made by The Member of Parliament for Spelthorne, David Wiltshire was very sensible. It was only defeated by 3 to 2 in the Committee. It had basically said that if there was a licensed taxi service in Slough, it should be able to come into Heathrow Airport to take passengers to Slough, if it so wished, and similarly for all the areas around the London boundary.

The Members were asked if anyone was against this proposal.

8. Cllr. Beer responded that he heartily supported the proposal. However, he thought that it was amazing to note that there were only five people debating this issue. He asked if the Committee could be advised when the subject was next going to be considered, in order that the local MPs could be lobbied.

The Chairman replied that the Committee had already reported on this matter to the Transport Committee. Any representation should now be made directly to Government by the Members' local authorities.

9. The Technical Adviser commented that the Government had to respond to the Transport Committee Report, hence the reason for his suggestion that the Committee should also hasten a response.

The Members agreed that they supported the Recommendation on Taxis.

10. With regard to Airport Charges, the Chairman stated that as Heathrow was already a regulated airport, the Committee would not make representations on this matter.

4082 COMPETITION COMMISSION; BAA AIRPORTS MARKET INVESTIGATION – ISSUES STATEMENT

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.505**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman referred to the Recommendation. The Committee had further time to deal with this matter, at a later stage in the Inquiry Procedure next year. This was agreed.

4083 GENERAL UPDATE ON FUTURE STRATEGY FOR HEATHROW AIRPORT

1. Mike Forster, BAA Strategy & Development Director, gave a general update on Heathrow: a new airport for London (*enclosed*).
2. Following on from this update, Members asked questions/responded.
3. Iain Hope commented that in relation to the refurbishment at Terminal 1, Landside shopping area, more guidance was needed to take the passengers through the airport, particularly to try to find the toilet and catering facilities. It was difficult to see if the present 'Information' facilities were still open.

Mike Forster thanked Iain Hope for this feedback, which was extremely helpful and would be noted.

4. Cllr. Potts remarked that for 10% of adult male people who were colour blind, the colour coding at the airport with an instruction 'to follow green lines', was not viable.

Mike Forster acknowledged this feedback. However, the important part to note was the fact that the wording would remain. BAA was keen to draw attention to transfers. The colour coding would not be Red or Green.

The Chairman thanked Mike Forster for this informative update.

4084 PROJECT FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF HEATHROW (PSDH)

1. (a) Surface Access Stakeholder Meeting. Summary of meeting of 12th September by Technical Adviser (HACC.501) had had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
(b) A short Progress Note was tabled by David Gray (DfT) which summarised the key developments in PSDH since the last HACC meeting in July.
2. The report contained details on the plans for consultation and information on the public exhibitions. The Department for Transport proposed to hold the exhibitions at around twelve locations around Heathrow, when the consultation was launched, including areas around Sipson, Colnbrook, Stanwell Moor and places further afield e.g. Windsor, Fulham and Barnes. Final decisions on locations had not yet been made.

The DfT were looking to hold the exhibitions throughout the working day, which would extend in to the early evening for those who were at work, and also to include some Saturday sessions.

With regard to one of the points raised at the last HACC meeting which referred to a leaflet drop in Ealing, Mr Gray said the DfT leaflet drop would focus on the 57 dBA noise contour areas.

The commencement of the consultation exercise would be very widely publicised in newspapers and all details would be placed on the DfT's website.

Mr. Gray said that it was not possible to inform the Committee at this stage of a publication date for the consultation. However, if the consultation was issued between now and the HACC meeting in December, which was expected, the DfT would certainly aim to bring a report to HACC at that stage.

In response to a question raised at the last meeting by Geoff Pope, representative from the London Assembly, relating to the 'Planning for a Sustainable Future' report, it was noted that the DfT were planning some stakeholder events in order to engage with elected members and also local authorities. The DfT would seek to ensure that the London Assembly were included.

With regard to ANASE (Attitudes to Noise Study), the Steering Group overseeing the Study had met in July to consider the consultants' draft report, together with comments received from independent peer reviewers.

Following that meeting, further work was underway to clarify a number of issues to ensure that the final report was robust and fit for publication. Resolution of these issues will determine the publication date. However, the DfT would aim to make a statement at the time of the Heathrow consultation launch, if not before.

Noise Mapping was under Defra's control. They were understood to be awaiting maps from two airports before they were able to make a consolidated presentation of their strategy. Mr. Gray said he was unable at present, to give a timetable for publication.

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

3. Virginia Godfrey stated that in relation to the preparation for consultation, the contents in the progress report that meetings had been held between the DfT with business interests including BAA to discuss a range of issues around the consultation, had left her very uncomfortable.

The subject of mixed-mode was to be included in the consultation and not published separately. How could the DfT assure the residents who were concerned that this was not a 'stitch up' with BAA and that it was a proper consultation.

David Gray responded that this issue had been discussed before at HACC. It was common knowledge that the DfT had worked with BAA, as was clearly envisaged in the 2003 White Paper, in order to provide the necessary expertise to inform the consultation.

The Department had firmly denied any suggestion of impropriety in this, and had rejected recent allegations in the Press that BAA were 'negotiating the terms of the consultation', or being allowed unduly to influence the outcome. It had been made clear that the PSDH work had been undertaken with a number of parties, including the CAA and BAA, to consider how further capacity at Heathrow could be achieved, consistent with the objectives in the White Paper. That is what the DfT were seeking to set out.

Although the Government had made a decision in principle on the third runway at Heathrow, this was dependent on certain factors. There was a need to demonstrate that these were achievable, after studying the impacts in detail, and to give people the opportunity to comment on various aspects of that. In that sense it was a genuine consultation.

With regard to mixed-mode - on which no policy position had yet been taken – Ministers had accepted that there should be a single consultation on Heathrow, combining all the relevant issues.

4. Virginia Godfrey asked if the DfT would be consulting on the length of the runway. David Gray responded that the details of the proposals would be set out in the consultation document.
5. Margaret Majumdar stated that it was noted from the Heathrow Project Board meetings that there was a draft of the consultation document known to exist since at least December 2006. As David Gray had told the Committee that he expected the consultation document to be published by the date of the next HACC meeting on 5th December 2007, it was surprising that he could not be more precise.

Mrs. Majumdar said that she had heard that local halls had been booked by the DfT for the end of October for the public exhibitions, although it was not known if this was true. All of the proposals would have an effect on Ealing and make the flight paths much worse than they were at present. Yet, from David Gray's comments, that there would be exhibitions as far away as Fulham and Barnes. This suggested that there would not be one in Ealing, although the LB Ealing's Environmental Health Officers had been given to understand by David's colleagues that an exhibition in Ealing was being considered.

Also, it was intimated that Ealing was being excluded from the leaflet drop because the 57 dBA contour only applied when it was year-round, and not when it affected Ealing, probably on easterly operations. If mixed-mode was introduced, the Cranford Agreement abolished and the Westerly Preference was lost, Ealing would be prevalently implicated in the year-round 57 dBA contour, and indeed a much higher dBA. It was hoped that it had not been decided that Ealing was totally out of the zone for a leaflet drop and local exhibition on the consultation.

David Gray responded that he could not confirm the final locations. If necessary, it did not strike him that it would be out of the question for Ealing residents to access an exhibition in, say, Barnes.

Margaret Majumdar replied that this was nonsense, as the interests of the residents of Barnes were completely different to those of the residents in Ealing.

Mr. Gray continued that he was not denying that their interests might be different, but the DfT could not run a limitless number of public exhibitions. He repeated the fact that no final commitments had yet been made as to the precise locations of the exhibitions.

6. Cllr. Potts said that the LB Ealing was being dismissed.

Mr. Gray responded that Ealing was not being dismissed, but the public should be able to travel to any one of the number of the proposed exhibitions, which was widely publicised. It was not practical to insist on any one specific location.

7. Cllr. Potts drew attention to the timing of the consultation. If it commenced in November, would an assurance be made that there was plenty of time to respond, bearing in mind that Christmas was rapidly approaching.

The time period for response to the consultation had been suggested as three months. If that three months included the Christmas and New Year period, it was actually cut down to two months. This was a trick that the Government frequently used. If this was the case, it was suggested that the time available should be extended. Mr Gray confirmed that this would be the case.

8. Cllr. .Elengorn thought that it was quite extraordinary that it had been mentioned that the residents in Ealing should visit an exhibition in Barnes. It was undignified to suggest this, as people would be unhappy at this suggestion as it would cause problems.

- 9 Cllr. Beer expressed his grave concern, that although the Committee had made a very strong point at the July meeting, that there should be at least two months between the publication of the Noise Study (ANASE), which had been ongoing for a considerable number of years, the Members had been told that this might not be published during the course of the consultation period. He thought that this was totally unacceptable. No doubt, thousands of pounds had been spent on consultation, and yet it would not be published until after the talks had finished on the future of Heathrow.

A request was made that some sense and order in the sequence of this was applied. All of the information that had been gathered over the years should be on the table before the future was considered. It was thought that there was some undertaking that this would happen.

David Gray responded that he could only refer to page 2 of his report in this respect.

10. The Chairman stated clearly there was considerable opposition to the consultation process. A request was made that David Gray should use his influence at the DfT to appease the concerns of the Members.

ACTION:
DAVID
GRAY

11. Margaret Majumdar asked if it would be possible for the Committee to write to the Transport Minister at the DfT to suggest that the proposed coverage of the consultation was not sufficient, as it did not take account of the people living under the easterly take-offs and ask if this could be recognised.

The Members agreed to this suggestion.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

4085 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 25th July 2007 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.

4086 NEW AIRPORT TRANSFER SERVICE FROM HEATHROW TO CENTRAL LONDON

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.504**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. (*Also for PSSC. Please refer to minute 4072.*)

4087 NTK WORKING GROUP

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 17th July 2007 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.

4088 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report and Borough Noise Line Figures for Quarter 2 (April-June 2007) and LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for Quarter 2 (April-June 2007) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4089 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

4090 NEWS RELEASES

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

4091 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY 5th DECEMBER 2007

DATES OF 2008 MEETINGS:

WEDNESDAY 30th JANUARY 2008

WEDNESDAY 26th MARCH 2008

WEDNESDAY 28th MAY 2008

WEDNESDAY 16th JULY 2008

WEDNESDAY 24th SEPTEMBER 2008

WEDNESDAY 3rd DECEMBER 2008 (SEMINAR)

