

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 16th July 2008 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Ian Potts	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. Mo Khursheed	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Ruth Cadbury	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Martin Elengorn	-	LB Richmond on Thames
Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy)	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Christopher Turrell	-	Bracknell Forest BC
Cllr. David Rowlands	-	Bucks County Council
Cllr. Patrick Roberts	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Balvinder Bains	-	Slough BC
Cllr. James Walsh (Deputy)	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Gerald Forsbrey (Deputy)	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos	-	Surrey County Council
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
John Gurney	-	TUC
Lynette Braithwaite	-	AUC
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Colin Mitchell	-	Independent
Mako Mochizuki	-	Independent

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Terry Morgan	-	Interim Managing Director
Simon Baugh	-	Head of Public Affairs

PRESENTERS

Philip Astle	-	UK Border Agency
Nita Easey	-	Noise Adviser, BAA

OTHERS

John Proudlove	-	NATS
----------------	---	------

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

1. Cllr. Nicholas Botterill (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr. Jim Maddan (Wandsworth BC)), Cllr. Paul Buttivant (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Dev Dhillon (South Bucks District Council), Iain Hope (LCCI), Paul Ellis (IATA), Roger Wiltshire (BATA), Philip Carlisle (GTMC), Susan Parsons (ABTA), Brian Yates (Consumers' Association), Frank Wingate (Future Heathrow), Susan Laurie (Independent), David Gray (DfT).

4165 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting held on 28th May 2008 were agreed.

4166 MATTERS ARISING

(a) Minute 4146 - Airwaves – BAA to place an article in the next edition to illustrate the workings of a Consultative Committee.

1. An article will be placed in Airwaves on the workings of a Consultative Committee. This is scheduled for the next edition.

(b) Minute 4146 - Chairman of the PSSC to send a letter to Mr. Terry Morgan to propose that Security staff were issued with a numbered identification badge

1. The letter had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

(c) Minute 4147 - Technical Adviser to send a submission to NATS on behalf of the Committee about the lack of consultation documents available to the residents

1. The letter, together with reply from NATS had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Margaret Majumdar stated that she believed the NATS response to the comprehensive letter sent by the Technical Adviser on behalf of the Committee was totally inadequate. It was suggested that a further communication should be sent to NATS to request answers to the points raised in the original letter.
3. The Technical Adviser said that the reply that had been received from NATS stated that they would be publishing their Consultation Feedback Report of all the consultation responses received by 22nd July 2008.

It may be the case that the comments made in the response by the Committee would have been taken notice of by NATS and included in the report. However, if this is not so, a second letter would be submitted. This was agreed.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

(d) Minute 4148 - BAA to supply copy of the Government's published response to the House of Commons Transport Committee Report on the Future of BAA.

1. A copy of this report had been supplied to the Secretariat. However, this could not be released until the publication date had passed.

(e) Minute 4152 - Technical Adviser to contact Defra to obtain copies of the published noise maps for urban areas.

1. The Technical Adviser stated that a letter had been received from the Deputy Chairman of HACAN/Clearskies, Gareth Harper. He was questioning the progress of the implementation of the European Directive on Noise, so far as an Action Plan was concerned to deal with excessive noise, by 18th July 2008.

The Members would remember that Wendy Hartnell addressed the Committee in November 2006 on the work of Defra on this subject, which they were running, rather than the Department for Transport.

The Technical Adviser reported that he had recently spoken with Wendy Hartnell, who had agreed that the target date of 18th July 2008 would not be achieved. However, Defra were working on this and expected to publish within the next few weeks, a copy of a consultation paper on their proposals for the Standards which airports would need to meet to comply with the Directive.

The final date by which all of the work had to be finalised was 18th January 2009. It was hoped that by the date of the September HACC meeting, a copy of the consultation document regarding the Standards which were to be achieved would be available for the Committee.

The consultation responses would be returned to Defra. They would need to make a decision and finalise the matter by the mid- January 2009.

(f) Minute 4156 - Technical Adviser to send a letter to the Competition Commission to reflect the discussion held by the Committee relating to the Interim Report on its Market Review of BAA.

1. The letter had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

(g) Minute 4158 - BAA to establish whether the closure of the Petrol Station in the Central Area was due to a total shut-down or a refurbishment.

1. BP had decided not to continue its lease on the site in the Central Terminal Area. No decision had yet been made as to whether the site would be re-let to another fuel supplier, or used for some other purpose. Once a decision had been made, this would be communicated to the HACC.

(h) Minute 4162 - Nita Easey to make a presentation on Night Quota Usage

1. This Item was covered under Minute 4170.

**4167 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT
Committee Membership**

1. Following the local Elections in May 2008, letters had been received from:-
Slough Borough Council confirming the appointment of Cllr. Balvinder Bains as the HACC Member and Cllr. James Walsh as Deputy, **London Borough of Ealing** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Ian Potts as the HACC Member and appointment of Cllr. James Randall as Deputy, **Buckinghamshire County Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. David Rowlands as the HACC Member and appointment of Cllr. Trevor Egleton as Deputy, **Runnymede Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Patrick Roberts as the HACC Member and Professor Moreton Moore as Deputy, **Bracknell Forest Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Chris Turrell as the HACC Member and Cllr Mary Ballin as Deputy, **Spelthorne Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Denise Grant and Cllr. George Trussler as the HACC Members and Cllr. Gerry Forsbrey and Cllr. Jack Pinkerton as the Deputies.

4168 HEATHROW MANAGEMENT MATTERS

- (a) Dialogue with Mr Terry Morgan, Interim Managing Director of Heathrow Airport.
 - (b) BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
1. Mr. Morgan stated that Heathrow were entering their busiest time of the year, now that the school term had ended for the Summer holiday period.

Traffic numbers generally continued to rise, although at a slower rate than experienced in the past. The reasons for this were two-fold. Firstly, the airport was at its capacity in terms of the numbers of movements. Therefore, the airlines normally achieve growth through increased load factors but had seen a slowing down of the rate of growth. Part of this was due to the very difficult economic circumstances which appeared to be looming. This had obviously affected consumer confidence and the aviation industry was not immune to that. A second major factor was the continued high price of oil and the way that this fed through to aviation fuel surcharges.

Whilst it was expected that Heathrow would continue to grow, certainly in the medium to long-term, it was fair to say that conditions were difficult for the airline industry, in the short-term.

Mr. Morgan said that he was pleased to report that **Terminal 5** was now running very well indeed. All of the teething troubles experienced at the opening in March 2008 had now been ironed out. The reaction received from both British Airways and BAA passenger satisfaction surveys had shown that the passengers thought that Terminal 5 was extremely good and was holding up the reputation for Heathrow.

As a consequence of the ability to operate Terminal 5 as it was designed, BAA had completed in June, the switch of a number of long-haul flights from Terminal 4 to Terminal 5. The lead-up to that was characterised by tremendous teamwork between British Airways and BAA. The success of the switch made positive media coverage.

The second and third round of the **airline moves** was underway to free up space, particularly in Terminals 2 and 3. On 4th July 2008, United Airlines and Air New Zealand moved out of Terminal 3 into Terminal 1, from where they were now operating.

In **Terminal 4**, a major extension and refurbishment programme had commenced, which it was anticipated would be completed by 2009-2010.

Generally, the performance of the airport in terms of **customer service** had been very good over the past few months.

As the Members would be aware, BAA was subject to a regulatory regime, whereby they had to pay money back to the airlines, if they failed to meet various service standards, e.g. security queuing, cleanliness, flight information.

In June 2008, the targets in respect of security queuing were met in their entirety. For 99.4% of the time, passengers queued for five minutes or less. For 100% of the time passengers queued for less than ten minutes. This was the result of much hard work and the recruitment of extra security staff. However, some SQR targets had been missed, primarily in Terminals 1 and 4 around Flight Information, Wayfinding and Departure Lounge crowding. This was resultant from the fact that there was considerable refurbishment work being undertaken in those Terminals. BAA clearly had to undertake more work to ensure that the passengers had sufficient Flight Information and Wayfinding information available to them.

The nett cost to Heathrow for the missed SQR's was approximately £700,000 for June, which was not an insubstantial sum of money.

BAA had some interesting experiences with the **Competition Commission** in early June, where the BAA team headed by Colin Matthews, Chief Executive, again reiterated its view that the major challenge facing the industry and the economy for that matter in the long run, was the provision of extra airport capacity, wherever that may be, and that the possible break up of BAA by the Competition Commission would do nothing to accelerate this and would in fact, slow it down.

The Competition Commission were due to publish their preliminary findings in September and BAA would be able to see if its views had been reflected in that.

Mr. Morgan reported that he and Mr. Colin Matthews had recently spent considerable time meeting with a number of MPs. The previous week Mr. Matthews was invited back to attend the **Transport Select Committee** to provide an update on Terminal 5. On the 15th July, BAA had hosted a meeting with a number of MPs from the surrounding constituencies of Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted.

This was a very positive meeting. Obviously, there were views expressed by MPs about airport expansion. There was a desire on the part of some MPs, to see BAA taking a more positive role in London Transport to the airport.

There was also some very strong views that the industry generally, and BAA in particular, should be more vocal in promoting the airports and also explain to people the levels of service that they were currently able to provide. This was in marked contrast to the public perception of the levels of service that were provided.

An interesting debate had taken place as to how the airports and the aviation industry generally could be better placed, as far as the public perception was concerned.

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

2. Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey commented that the glowing report as outlined by Mr. Morgan compared markedly to the reports read in the newspapers, of passengers running around the World chasing their baggage.

It would seem that the Committee were told one story by BAA, but in fact were reading another in the media.. There appeared to be enormous gaps in the PR. He asked what BAA intended to do about this.

Terry Morgan responded that this statement reflected very accurately the sentiments made to BAA at the meeting held on the previous evening.

Firstly, BAA wanted to ensure that they were delivering a good service on a consistent basis. As BAA entered the Summer period they could demonstrate that this was good. After that, it was thought that they would be in a strong position to start to state the actual facts and the truth about the level of the service that both BAA and the airlines delivered at Heathrow. This would be promoted very loudly to the audience of the media and the trade generally. It was fair to say that perception often lagged behind fact in this area.

However, it was difficult to get the media to write positive news bulletins. They seemed to take the view that newspapers sold better on bad news stories.

BAA had a very good switch into Terminal 5 (Switch 2.1) and yet it received virtually any news coverage at all.

3. Margaret Majumdar referred to the 'Passengers with Restricted Mobility' section of the report. It was noted that there would be a 24-hour Control Room. She asked why this was needed when usually there were no flights after the last departure (usually 12.15 a.m. to the first arrival - 4.30 a.m.). Did this mean that the Control Room would be staffed for 24 hours or would an answerphone be in operation.

Mr. Morgan responded that he believed that the dedicated PRM Control Room would be staffed, in line with the 24-hour Control Rooms for the remainder of the operation.

4. Cllr. Khursheed referred to a recent report in 'Skyport' which had stated that passengers in Terminal 5 were still losing anything up to 1,000 bags per week. Also, in the same edition of 'Skyport' that the delays in the Flight Switchover (Lufthansa) were the fault of BAA. He asked what the truth was behind these stories.

Mr. Morgan replied that BAA did not get visibility of all of the baggage figures. It was understood that the figures quoted by an ex-BA baggage handler were incorrect. Also, it had been reported that it was due to the T5 baggage system itself, which again, was incorrect. Particularly on transfer bags, one of the reasons that they 'miss' was due to the fact that the inbound flight from which the bags should be taken from often arrives late and the bags simply do not have time to get from that aircraft to the departing aircraft. The transfer time is too short. It is not the fault of the baggage system. Another reason was there were significant distances between terminals for the baggage to be transferred.

In the longer-term, the solution to the problem would be to group airlines in alliances, so that the bags to be travelled are in the terminals. It was part of the transformation plan for the alliances to be co-located. The baggage system in Terminal 5 was very good and one of the best on the airport.

With regard to the Lufthansa issue, BAA did not yet know if this would be delayed. The implications of British Airways not moving totally out from Terminal 4 were still being considered as a priority. A very complex piece of work was underway to try to work out how the time could be recovered that was lost.

It was thought that by the September HACC meeting, Mike Forster, Group Strategy Director would be able to give the Committee a much fuller brief on where BAA stood, both subsequently and going forward.

5. Cllr. Rowlands referred to how the key service is provided for Passengers with Reduced Mobility (PRMs) He had noted that in Terminal 5, BAA were still responsible for this assistance, but in the other Terminals, external companies were used.

As the service had now been running for approximately one month, had any problems occurred and if so, what remedial action had been taken to overcome these.

Mr. Morgan responded that BAA had two external companies to provide assistance for PRMs; OCS who handled PRM duties in Terminals 3 and 5 and Mitie who handled PRM duties in Terminals 1, 2 and 4.

From a BAA point of view, all of the PRM activities were now provided by a third party.

The contracts were introduced in early July 2008. However, the Terminal 5 contract was introduced when it opened in March 2008.

Any 'bedding down' problems that had been encountered in the first few days had now been smoothed out, with the Terminal 5 contract in particular, operating extremely well. British Airways were very pleased with the service that they were receiving.

BAA were working very closely with the contractors and the airlines to ensure that the service was as advertised.

6. Andy Hull commented that with regard to the subject of PRMs, amongst the complaints that the Passenger Services Sub-Committee looked at, included one from a passenger who had experienced problems on 20th June 2008 in Terminal 4. This was three days after the introduction of the service.

The passenger had been left at the foot of the steps to the aeroplane and told that was where the special assistance finished. This seemed to be an issue of staff not knowing what they should be doing in provision of service. The complaint awaited a response from BAA.

Mr. Morgan replied that this incident should not have happened, and would personally apologise to the passenger concerned. With any new contract, there would always be issues about making sure that the staff knew where they had to go and the equipment that they had to use.

One of the other issues that had taken longer than BAA would have liked to finalise was the flow of information from the airlines to the service provider. The service provider issues an advance notification of when there was a requirement. That requires a good line of communication from the airlines to the airport company. In some cases this had not been as good as it should have been.

7. Cllr. Bains asked if all of the British Airways flights from Terminal 1 had moved. If not, when would the remainder relocate.

Terry Morgan responded that there were three routes that remained in Terminal 1, to Spain and Nice. These were due to be relocated in September/October.

Cllr. Bains said that his concern was the fact that it was still confusing.

Some flights were in still in T1, T4 and others in Terminal 3.

Terminal 5 had been opened to British Airways. The remainder of the flights should be moved to make it easier for the passenger.

Mr. Morgan responded that he agreed. Clearly, if it had been possible to open Terminal with all of the planned British Airways flights relocating at the same time, this would have been done.

8. John Gurney commented that with regard to the transfer of baggage in Terminal 5, he understood that it was well below 20 bags per 1,000 that were 'missing' the flights. This was the best figure that had been some for a considerable time.

4169 UK BORDER AGENCY

1. Presentation by Philip Astle, Director, Border Force Heathrow, UK Border Agency. Mr. Astle talked about the re-organisation of the several agencies, formerly responsible for safe-guarding UK Borders, into the single Border Agency and how this affected their operations at Heathrow (*enclosed*).

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

2. Andy Hull referred to the IRIS system. He asked if in order to help the queuing situation, it would be better to promote more widely the new technology that was available and keep the registering facilities open longer for enrolment.

Philip Astle responded that at Heathrow, the enrolment facilities were open for much longer than they were at Gatwick.

A much wider variety of separate electronic gate systems was being trialled by BAA on two sites in Manchester and Stansted.

There was no doubt that Biometrics would be moved to increasingly on a long-term basis, but how quickly this happened was uncertain. This depended on the technology and the appetite of the public.

3. John Gurney asked if the UK would move to the same Biometric system as Europe or will each Member State have its own system.

Mr. Astle replied that for Biometrics, a system was in existence that tried to ensure that it was the same. However, there were some countries where this was not the case. The UK would go with the majority. However, it could not be promised that every country in Europe would all stick with the same system. It must also be remembered that countries across Europe were all moving at different paces. Some people had Biometric Passports whilst others did not and were years away from having them.

John Gurney referred to a complaint which had been received into the Passenger Services Sub-Committee expressing concern at the perception of the Cross-Border staff at Immigration.

The concept is that Immigration staff should be putting over a good view of Britain as people arrived. However, if an altercation breaks out in the Immigration Hall, this does not bode well.

Mr. Philip Astle responded that he would be delighted to take the individual complaint, to respond. It was agreed that an altercation at the Border did not bode well.

4. Cllr. Saliagopoulos asked for clarification of the queuing times.

Mr. Astle confirmed that the Ministerial enforced upper limits were of 45 minutes for non-EEA passengers and 25 minutes for EEA passengers with a target to hit that for 95% of the time.

Cllr. Saliagopoulos referred to the outlined improved partnership and what benefit had this achieved to date. Also, how would it be made more difficult for people to cross the Border.

Philip Astle replied that the key to making the Border more secure was to trace the movement of people. To do this, it was necessary to count them in and out of the country. There was a system entitled e-Borders, which the airlines were being asked to participate in, by providing passenger information in advance of the flight. This would enable the Border Agency to tell who was on the aircraft whilst it was in the air and check the passengers against various designated measures. Therefore, rather than checking people when they arrived, the procedure would be completed by the time they land and the Border Agency would know that there were four people on board the flight that they wished to talk with.

This procedure would not be fully operational for another three years, but it had commenced and the numbers would build up. By 2011, 90% of passengers arriving at Heathrow would be counted in and out.

With regard to partnerships, these were already in place internally. Every day a report was received about the fact that Customs & Immigration were exposed to each other's jobs, which allowed the catching of criminals and traffickers.

5. Cllr. Bains commented that firstly, in relation to IRIS he had witnessed a passenger who was unable to receive assistance when the system was not working. Secondly, as Passports were not checked as people exit the country, it was understood that a passenger managed to board an aeroplane with no Passport and travelled to Canada where he claimed Asylum. It was thought that this practice was still happening, with groups who were getting people through Security checks who had language problems. He asked if this matter would be addressed.

Mr. Astle replied that within the last two months, fourteen groups of facilitators had been arrested. This was a success, given the fact that this figure was more than for the whole year period, two years ago. However, as long as there were people prepared to pay a vast amount of money to others to traffic on their behalf, it would be a matter that needed to be constantly looked at by the UK Border Agency.

In relation to IRIS, if a passenger walked through the gate, it would open and let that person in. However, if that person was someone of interest to the UK Border Agency, they would be unable to get out the other side.

The IRIS would display a message to indicate to join the queue. That way a person would be picked up. When a person went through IRIS, whether a person was a trusted traveller or not, they would be checked against the systems. Otherwise, a person could register for IRIS and then become a criminal. A passenger would only be trusted for as long as they were not on any of the warning systems.

6. Cllr. Forsbrey asked for a definition of a primary checkpoint.

Mr. Astle explained that currently, when a passenger entered an airport, they would go to the Immigration line, to be checked. That person would then gather their bags and go to the Customs checkpoint. There may or may not be someone at the Customs checkpoint, dependent on whether it was thought that there was a passenger on a flight that was a Customs risk.

At the moment there were two checkpoints. In the future, there would be a single primary checkpoint. This would welcome a passenger into the UK, requesting to see their Passport and to ask what they were carrying and if there was anything that they wished to declare at Customs.

This was currently being trialled at Gatwick Airport. The UK Border Agency would consider how this experiment worked before it was rolled out at other airports.

7. The Chairman thanked Mr. Astle for the presentation and invited him to return to a HACC meeting in a few months time to further update the Members. This was agreed.

4170 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE

1. A presentation on **Night Flying Restrictions** was made by Nita Easey, BAA Heathrow Noise Adviser as (*enclosed*).

Following on from this presentation, Members asked questions/responded

2. The Chairman asked if the delayed flights still counted against the Movements and Quota Limits and if dispensed flights occurred on a regular basis e.g. daily.

Nita Easey replied that normally delayed flights did count against both the Movements and the Quota Limits. Normal operating delays had to be taken into account in managing the night Movements and Quota Limits. They were only dispensed if they complied with the exceptional circumstances as defined by the DfT. The dispensed flights did not occur on a daily basis, but only in exceptional circumstances e.g. day after day there would be none and then, as when the severe foggy conditions occurred during the Christmas 2006 period, which lasted several days, this caused Air Traffic Control delays over several days. There was a large number of dispensations during that time as it was so prolonged but this was very unusual. On a daily basis, BAA had to plan and manage night flights in order to meet the movements and quota limits for the Season.

Nita said it was also important to note that a process called “netting” took place. For example, if BAA had ten flights that were delayed and qualified for dispensation, and the following morning there were five flights that were delayed which had been scheduled to come in during the Night Period, but did not because of the same problem, it would be necessary to take those five away from the ten. Therefore, only 5 would be given dispensations. This was known as ‘netting’. The reason for this requirement was that BAA were not allowed to gain from dispensations in any way, by gaining Quota or Movements to the normal Limits. Dispensations were allowed purely to deal with the ‘extra night flights over and above the normal Limits’ caused by the exceptional circumstances.

3. Virginia Godfrey congratulated Nita Easey on the Flight Evaluation Report 2005/06 and 2006/07 which was very clear and easy to understand.

With regard to dispensations, it had been stated that these were rare and only for serious hardship or widespread disruption. However, on page 46-47 of the Report, the Tables indicated that it was a figure of 550. This was more than one per day.

Nita Easey responded that when the severe fog occurred during Christmas 2006, there were nearly 260 dispensations over a four-day period. This was due to the fact that there was a problem. This tended to happen. A block would occur and then they would stop.

When the figures were looked at over a Season, if they were averaged out per day, it looked as if it was occurring every day, but this was not the case. That in itself was exceptional, that there was such a large number for one period, but it was over several days where there was constant bad weather which caused widespread and prolonged Air Traffic Control delays, which was one of the reasons for granting dispensations.

4. Margaret Majumdar stated that she only knew in detail of the flights when the wind was in the East. From her experience, on most average nights, there was 3 or 4 departures after 11.30 p.m.

Mrs. Majumdar asked if the hold-back assumed that there would be this number. Also, linked with that how often did it occur that BAA said to an airline that as it was 11.30 p.m. it was not possible to depart.

Nita Easey explained that an Independent company named ACL (Aircraft Co-ordination Limited) issued all the slots at Heathrow. As part of doing that, they looked at the Limits on Night Movements and Night Quota which restricted how many Night Flights could be scheduled (both arrivals and departures). ACL would allocate the slots and the requisite Movements and Quota to cover those scheduled flights, but kept back a number of Movements and Quota to cover normal operational difficulties.

Every week, BAA would look at how many had been used and would provide to the Operations Managers who made the decision on the night, how many Movements and quota was available that week.. Again, because it was operational problems, one week it might be X number and another week Y.

As BAA did not know how this would work out, they tried to average it out at the beginning of the Season. This meant that if a bad week was experienced e.g. six Movements had been quoted, and those Movements had been used up by the Wednesday, there would be no more allowed. Anybody else who suffered a delay would be stopped. It was on a first-come first served basis. There would be nothing left.

Usage of Movements and Quota was monitored every day and managed to ensure the Limits would not be broken. As the Season progressed, therefore, it might be necessary to reduce the number of Movements and Quota allowed per week.

Margaret Majumdar replied that the explanation did not add up to the experience. It was presumed that the Quota hold-back did allow three departures, on average, per night. However, the question had not been answered as to how often BAA stated to an airline that they could not depart after 11.30 p.m.

Nita Easey responded that BAA did not collate data as to how often they had instructed an airline that they were unable to depart, as this information was unnecessary in order to manage Movement and Quota.. What was important was what had been used and what remained so as to ensure the limits were not broken.

Margaret Majumdar said that whilst this may be so, BAA did know how many Movements were kept back to allow for late departures.

Nita Easey said that this varied from week to week as BAA managed the available movement and quota each day and week to ensure that the limits were met at the end of the Season.

(Secretary's Note): The Flight Evaluation Report 2007 has since been published and is now *(enclosed)*.

5. Cllr. Roberts understood that there was an average of 15 Movements per night. According to the graph for 2006, there looked to be another 500 Movements for the Summer period, which was 2.5 times more than the Winter.

It was thought that those colleagues representing Noise Groups on the Committee would agree why should these not be totalled out of the Quota. Why could it not be that there was an average of 15 per night and it had to be kept within that. Why was it not possible to abolish the 'exempt'. Both BAA and the airlines had to work together and could be allowed 15 Movements per night as a maximum.

Nita Easey responded that the Noise Groups referred to had already made this point previously.

The response made by the DfT indicated that they thought that the current method was a better way of dealing with it.

If all flights were covered, just as allowances had to be made for normal fluctuations of flights within the Limits that had been set, similarly, allowance would still need to be made for the fact that exceptional circumstances would arise. The concern of the DfT was that accordingly, the Limits would need to be increased.

If the exceptional circumstances did not occur, effectively the airlines would gain extra movements and quota every season. During some years, exceptional circumstances were less than in other years. The view of the DfT was that the Limits were set to cover normal operating circumstances, but as had been shown, there would be these exceptional problems, which could not be predicted and therefore they should be dealt with as special cases and only given dispensations if they complied with the strict Rules. Otherwise, the DfT would need to grant BAA a higher quota of Limits to take account of those.

Cllr. Roberts asked what BAA would 'run out' of first, Movements or Quota Period.

Nita Easey responded that BAA did not 'run out'. Whichever Limit was reached first would mean that no further flights could operate even where Movements or Quota in the "other" Limit remained.

Cllr. Roberts said that it would be of interest to learn whether, as the end of a Season was reached, there were Quota Points left or Movements.

Nita Easey replied that this information and other details were provided to HACC members in each of the Night Quota Reports.

6. Cllr. Cadbury stated that the Members of the Committee who represented those residents living around Heathrow valued the fact that there was a Night Flights system and that there were strict controls on the flights at Heathrow.

Ruth Cadbury reminded the Members that a discussion had been held by the Committee at previous meetings on weather related exceptional circumstances. She asked if there had been any of these in the last two years and thought that there were.

It was thought than generally, both in the UK and globally there had been more severe weather situations. Therefore, the graph on that was likely to continue rising. Assuming that was true, and it was believed to be the case, should this not trigger a review of the rules relating to dispensations?

Nita Easey responded that she was unable to alter that, and could not speak from a policy point of view as the DfT made the decision. Unfortunately, they were not present at the meeting to comment.

However, it was thought that the DfT would state that they reviewed this every 5-6 years. A review had been undertaken recently which took effect from Winter 2006 and stipulated what would happen until 2012. It was doubtful that they would review again until that time period, unless there was a change in policy.

7. Cllr. Beer commented that approximately ten nights ago, between the period of 12.15 p.m. - 12.30 p.m. and shortly afterwards, there were eleven take-offs within that quarter-of-an-hour period over Old Windsor. It was incessant.

The point was made that if there was such a substantial delay, those flights should not have taken off during the Night Period, they should have been held back until the next day. If this occurrence was to become a frequent practice, it would be very troublesome indeed.

Nita Easey responded that although the circumstances were unknown, from the description given, it did sound as if there was a problem on that particular night. Normally, BAA tried to get all of the flights which were scheduled out before 11.30 p.m.

If it was necessary to allow some to depart after this time, they were sent as early as possible.

Nita Easey said that she would look into the records to see if she could match up those circumstances over the past few weeks and would report back to Cllr. Beer with the findings.

ACTION:
NITA
EASEY

(Secretary's Note): Nita Easey has replied to Cllr Beer.

4172 IMPLEMENTATION OF EU LEGISLATION FOR PEOPLE WITH REDUCED MOBILITY

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.534**) (*also for PSSC*) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
Persons with Reduced Mobility (PRM) - changes to service provision at Heathrow from 17th June 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman stated that the Committee had a role to play in this, particularly the Passenger Services Sub-Committee, but had experienced difficulty with BAA in obtaining a contact to talk to.

However, Simon Baugh, Head of Public Affairs was the new contact point for the Committee and it was thought that improvements were evident with management. It was hoped that this subject could be taken forward with no problems from now on.

3. The Technical Adviser commented that the point at issue was the fact that the Committee had still been unable to resolve the question about consultation on arrival and departure points.

There were one or two people who believed that it was the Airline Operator Committee's responsibility, rather than the HACC. However, the Technical Adviser said that he remained of the opinion that the HACC had a role in looking at this in consultation with BAA and that the Committee should be pursuing this with them.

It was believed that the Chairman of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee, Philip Carlisle, accepted that view at the meeting held on the morning of 16th July 2008. Therefore, the Committee would be asking BAA for information on this matter.

4. Simon Baugh stated that in regard to BAA reporting on the charges received from expenses paid, it was thought that this was more appropriate to the AOC, because it was the airlines who were helping to fund it.

Clearly, the HACC, particularly the Passenger Services Sub-Committee, had a role in terms of working with BAA to ensure that the appropriate level of service was being given to the passengers.

This would be worked through to establish the best way to take the matter forward.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

4173 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 28th May 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.
2. Cllr. Horn referred to Minute 3.2, regarding the low level of lighting in the lifts. He suggested that the tungsten bulbs should be replaced with low energy bulbs. These would give much more light with less heat, and the bulbs last longer.

Andy Hull responded that the PSSC had discussed this issue several times and had already made such a suggestion. However, it was not as easy as it sounded, because there were various technical problems with energy available and the type of fittings.

4174 NTK WORKING GROUP

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 20th May 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4175 HEATHROW AIRPORT COMMUNITY INSULATION BOARD LIMITED

1. Minutes of the meetings of the Community Insulation Board held on 28th January 2008 and 19th March 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Mr. Gerry Ceaser as Acting Chairman, outlined the work of the Heathrow Airport Community Insulation Board.

The Board was set up by the Government requiring BAA to do so. There were six Members, one from BAA who was the Chairman, plus five from the community. In the two-year period that the Board had been set up, the fourth BAA Chairman was in place. The remainder of the Board remained as originally appointed.

There was a £5 million fund available per annum to spend on the community insulation over five years. It affected the area contained within the 57 Leq contour with approximately sixty properties, which were largely schools in the LB Hounslow. It also took in other public buildings.

It was difficult to spend the money, as the Board had to start from scratch on the subject. However, noise surveys had now been carried out of all the properties that were accessible to ascertain the benefit and they had been put into priority order.

The first schemes amounting to £3 million plus, were now contracted and up and running. There were schedules being prepared for further schemes to be on-stream shortly.

Problems had been found other than the necessity for sound insulation e.g. asbestos in panels and establishing whether the ventilation installation should be extract input or air conditioning. It had also been difficult to carry out the work, due to the fact that if it was in a school building, they did not wish works to be carried during term time. The bulk of the work had to be carried out in the Summer holidays. Some schools who were eligible for the scheme, did not wish work to be carried out.

The scheme had been delayed to an extent, due to the cancellation of meetings by BAA if the Chairman was unable to attend. It was proposed at the next meeting to appoint a Vice-Chairman. It was hoped that this would move the matter forward.

The Board would also like to be able to revise the 57 Leq contour down to a 54 Leq contour, which it was thought was a more realistic level these days. This would require convincing the Government of the need to do that. However, it had already been introduced into the conversations and it was hoped this issue would move forward.

Technical expertise had been given to the Board, both on sound, ventilation and on building works. All of the work was contracted through BAA, rather than directly. Virtually all of the insulation works that had been carried out to date was through BAA's preferred contractors.

3. Cllr. Ruth Cadbury spoke as a joint Member of the Community Trust Insulation Board. She said that whilst they were grateful for the funding from BAA for use on public buildings, the scheme had limitations, which were not only on the size of the contour, but that it also only applied to buildings as they were, and as their use was, at the time the Aviation White Paper was released.

Many of the schools would need to be substantially refurbished in the future with Government funding required for better facilities. However, the scheme specifically excluded the use of BAA funding to support the additional costs of providing ventilation and noise insulation for any new or substantially refurbished buildings. This meant that the Local Authorities or another part of the public sector would need to fund this cost, not the cause of the noise. This was the worst limitation of the scheme.

4176 ANNUAL MEETING OF CHAIRMEN OF AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

1. Report of meeting held on 11th/12th June 2008 by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.533**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman thanked Terry Morgan and Colin Matthews for hosting the meeting of the Chairmen of the UK Consultative Committees at Heathrow. It was a very successful occasion with a good business meeting and everyone was looked after very well.
3. Virginia Godfrey asked if there was further information available on the consultation on the ANASE Report - Paragraph A of the Appendix entitled 'Addressing Aircraft Noise'. It stated that *'the findings had been shared with the CAA and that it was anticipated that a consultation on a way forward would be undertaken with interested stakeholders in the Autumn'*.

The Technical Adviser responded that the Department for Transport had recognised that there were many criticisms on the ANASE Report and had undertaken to carry out more work with consultants and further consultation.

As this stage, it was understood there were no further details put out about this, other than they recognised that they could do much more work on the subject.

4177 TERMINAL 5 OPENING

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC 535**) together with Speech made by Colin Matthews BAA Chief Executive, at the Transport Times Conference on 25th June 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. The Chairman informed the Members that Mr. Matthews. BAA Chief Executive would be attending the September HACC meeting.

4178 AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL AT HEATHROW

1. Problems of non-English speaking Pilots. Copy of news article from 'The Times' received from the Member of the Committee representing LAANC, Rob Gibson had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman introduced John Proudlove, General Manager at NATS to comment on this incident.

Mr. Proudlove stated that it was important to note that NATS were not the 'Police of the Sky' with regard to the application of the ICAO requirements for the English language NATS were on the receiving end of those requirements. Obviously, the Controllers had to deal with many visitors to Heathrow who were not native English speakers and the consequences of that.

Whilst comment could not be made as to how appropriate the rules were with regard to the timescales of implementation, it could be said that this incident, which related to a Polish aeroplane which was airborne from Heathrow in June 2007, and suffering subsequent navigation problems, was a very difficult situation to cope with.

It was suggested that there would be many British Pilots, who faced with a similar situation would find it challenging. There was certainly lesson learning on both sides; by the Pilots with regard to the way that the situation was managed, and certainly within the Air Traffic Service provision, there were improvements which could have been made. This had been taken on board and these kind of activities were included within the emergency training, so that NATS could in every way possible, prepare the Controllers. It was known that the airlines do the same, by preparing themselves for where the unusual happens and they had to cope with a difficult situation.

Safety is the absolute priority with regards to the Air Traffic service provision at Heathrow, as it was throughout the rest of the UK. It was hoped that the Committee was reassured by that. This was a very difficult situation to cope with and the fact that English was not the first language of the crew did not help the matter, as the AAIB clearly indicated in the Report. However, the system did work, insomuch that the incident was managed and the aircraft landed safely at Heathrow.

3. The Chairman stated that he had attended a meeting, where it had been suggested that although there was a language problem, this was not the main issue, but equipment failure. He asked if this was correct.

Mr. Proudlove responded that this was correct. The root cause of the problem was due to the fact that when the crew was telling the aeroplane where it was on the ground at Heathrow i.e. putting in the lat and long co-ordinates, unfortunately, they put East in, instead of West. This caused the aeroplane to think it was 33 miles down the road, on the other side of the Meridian. The aeroplane knew it was travelling in the right direction, but unfortunately was starting from the wrong place. Once it became airborne and immediately went into power, the crew were always going to have a problem.

The fact that the situation was recovered, was a credit to all involved.

When an aeroplane goes off-piste, with the requirements to communicate and moving away from standard phrases that would be used in an ATC, and the need to quickly get into that, communication becomes more difficult.

4. Andy Hull referred to the newspaper article which had stated that this error had taken place before the aeroplane had taken off and caused the instruments to fail. It was thought that Pilots, being skilled in their profession would notice that their instruments had failed before they had taken off. Therefore, it was of question why they made the decision to take-off or that they tried to abort the take-off.

Mr. Proudlove responded that there were clear indicators within the full AAIB Report that question perhaps, that everything the crew reported back to the Air Accident Investigation Branch, was not necessarily what actually occurred in the cockpit. They had certainly given a sign that there were opportunities to recognise that there were positional errors in the original selections.

5. Cllr. Cadbury stated that she believed that the Committee had received insufficient answers to questions raised with NATS, following some of the other incidents that had occurred and discussed at previous meetings, when reassurance had been sought from the AAIB. It was thought that all the Members of HACC were very worried about safety issues in such an intensively used airspace as Heathrow.

John Proudlove responded that he would be delighted to attend a future HACC meeting to share the thoughts of NATS on any recent incidents and investigations which had given cause for concern to the Committee. Safety is the absolute No. 1 priority with regard to the Air Traffic Service provision at Heathrow. It was a message that all of the NATS staff were brought into and a lesson that was taken to every Forum.

6. The Technical Adviser stated that the Committee had made representations to the Civil Aviation Authority as the people who instruct NATS on some of these matters. It may be remembered that the CAA had responded that they were bound by the Rules laid under the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) for the conduct of ATC operations, and that the CAA did issue a Notice to the Manual for Air Traffic Control Services which laid more emphasis on the need for Controllers to try to persuade Pilots not to fly across heavily built-up areas such as London, as occurred in the case of an Evergreen 747 a couple of years ago.

Also, more recently, of a Business Jet aircraft that was travelling into Farnborough and the Pilot consequently decided that it did not want to, but landed at Heathrow instead, when the aircraft could have gone as easily to its first alternate destination of Stansted, and when it was offered, Gatwick Airport. In the end, it was decided by the Pilot for whatever reason, (and it did not come over clearly in the AAIB Report) that he wanted to come into Heathrow nevertheless.

Therefore, representations had been made to the CAA, where small amendments had been issued to the Manual for Air Traffic Controllers, but could go no further as they were bound by the Rules of the International Civil Aviation Organisation, whose Headquarters were in Montreal, and of whom there were nearly 200 different countries who belonged to it. Therefore, any changes would require certainly a majority agreement from them, if not all.

7. Rob Gibson said that he had originally raised the point on the Polish Pilot and thanked Mr. Proudlove for the explanation he gave to the Committee. However, the concern shown by Cllr. Cadbury was reiterated. There was an obviously an element of communication breakdown with the Pilot of some kind.

Rob Gibson asked Mr. Proudlove how could the risk be reduced of this type of incident re-occurring.

Mr. Proudlove responded that he did not know the outcome as to whether the airlines had changed the procedures. Much of it centred around the requirements of the Pilots or crew to cross-check and double-check with regards to the data that had been submitted into the flight management system. It was thought that there were also safety nets that did not prevent this incident which could have rescued it, when the aeroplane was in the vicinity of the holding point and it was actually telling the crew that it did not know where it was. Unfortunately, there were a series of holes lined up on this occasion, but there were barriers with regard to a proper process, which should prevent similar incidents arising in the future.

8. Margaret Majumdar said that this was potentially a very serious incident. The track as shown cut across several flight paths. Although it did not state what time of day this occurred, it was presumed that there were a considerable number of other aircraft in the area at the time.

It was not understood why the matter was not previously reported to the Committee or to the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group before it reached the AAIB.

9. The Technical Adviser commented that he received the monthly AAIB Reports, the last of which was July 2008. There had been no mention of this particular incident in it. It was presumed that they put out a special report on this, which had yet to be found.

With regard to other incidents, it was fairly routine for some of them to take a year or two on certain investigations, as they were extremely detailed and complex. It took the AAIB in Farnborough a long time to check on all the details and aspects of it relevant to the parts of the aeroplanes and the Pilots concerned.

10. Margaret Majumdar responded that whilst this may be so, it was of surprise that no one at BAA thought it relevant to report this matter to the Committee, long before the AAIB Report was received.

Simon Baugh responded that this would not be the type of matter brought to the attention of the BAA Public Affairs Department.

Nita Easey added that it was also not a matter that the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group would address. NATS would be aware of it, but it was not a BAA issue as they were not responsible for events outside of the airport.

11. John Proudlove agreed that he would take this action away to speak with Colin Wood, BAA Head of Airside Operations. He suggested that on a monthly basis, a report could be compiled of those incidents that it was thought might be of interest to the Committee, and if necessary, address the Members at a HACC meeting to explain any ongoing investigations, in advance of an official Report being published.

ACTION:
JOHN PROUDLOVE

12. Margaret Majumdar asked at what time of day did the incident occur.

John Proudlove replied that the incident took place at 10.05 a.m. (peak-time).

13. Cllr. Elengorn asked if there were equivalent bodies for aeroplanes leaving this airport, arriving at more obscure destinations where the Air Traffic Controllers might not be up to standard and the Pilots might not have a second or third language to cope with the situation.

Mr. Proudlove said that many of the airline users at Heathrow were challenged by the service provision at certain destinations. NATS had recently conducted a survey with British Airways. One of the comments stated that the service provision at Heathrow was the best in the World.

14. Cllr. Beer pointed out that the problem was the language barrier as well. He thought that it might be appropriate for the Committee Members to contact their MPs, to put the word into the official arena to try to get international action to highlight the problem.

John Proudlove responded that English was the main language worldwide. It was just the timescales for the implementation of the ICAO's recommendations.

Cllr. Beer continued that the Report stated that very few of the Pilots were appropriately qualified.

15. The Technical Adviser commented that the Members should not always believe the articles in the newspapers. The International Civil Aviation Organisation had only in the last month published the requirements for Pilot proficiency in languages, which they required all their Member States to contribute to. At the moment it was not clear, but there was ongoing action to try to improve the situation.

4179 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for May and June 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4180 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report and Borough Noise Line Figures for October-December 2007 and Quarter 1 (January-March 2008) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4181 NEWS RELEASES

1. New Releases had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. The Technical Adviser referred to Item C and H. On Item C, it showed up that there were a number of Press Releases published by BAA regarding a variety of events that were occurring at the Airport. e.g. introducing electronic radar checks. However, HACC had not been made aware of this by BAA, only receiving the information from its own Intelligence (News at UK Airports).

A request was made to BAA that in future, it would most helpful if HACC could receive copies of their News Releases, as some of them related closely to items which were raised at the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meetings.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

With regard to Item H, the Members had discussed the principle of this at the PSSC meeting on the morning of 28th July 2008, as it related to the Rules laid down by the European Commission for paying compensation to airline passengers who had their flights delayed or cancelled by airlines. Not many people were aware of this.

In the Terminals at Heathrow, there was very little evidence of advice displayed to inform passengers that they were entitled to significant sums of money in compensation.

In Terminal 2, there was only one poster displayed, which was placed by the doors at a point where hardly any airline passenger would be inclined to stop and read it. There was also the question of whether all the check-in desks, in the Terminals had a Notice on show, as was the practice, which advised passengers that if they were upset by the actions of the airlines, they were entitled to ask for compensation and request details.

Certain Members of the PSSC had asked for this information at the check-in desks and caused much concern, as the staff working on the desks did not know very much about the policy.

4182 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY 24th SEPTEMBER 2008