

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 26th March 2008 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. John Oswell (Deputy)	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Josephine Barrett (Deputy)	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Felicity Barwood	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Martin Elengorn	-	LB Richmond on Thames
Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy)	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. David Rowlands	-	Bucks County Council
Cllr. Patrick Roberts	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Julia Long	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Dev Dhillon	-	South Bucks District Council),
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Victor Argawal (Deputy)	-	Surrey County Council
Cllr. Christopher Wright	-	London Councils
Geoff Pope	-	London Assembly
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
Philip Carlisle	-	GTMC
Lynette Braithwaite	-	AUC
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
John Gurney	-	TUC
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Mako Mochizuki	-	Independent

OTHERS

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

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Mark Bullock (for Minute 4128)	-	Managing Director
Ben Morton	-	Director of Communications

CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

1. Iain Hope (LLCI), Brian Yates (Consumers' Association), Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos (Surrey County Council), Cllr. Christopher Turrell (Bracknell Forest BC), Cllr. Ruth Cadbury (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Jim Maddan (LB Wandsworth), Cllr. Phillip Bicknell (RB Windsor & Maidenhead), Cllr. Mo Khursheed (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Paul Buttivant (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Nicholas Botterill (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Susan Laurie (Independent), Colin Mitchell (Independent), Mike Walsh (Independent).

4125 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting held on 30th January 2008 were agreed with the following amendments:-

1. Virginia Godfrey requested that Minute 4115, point 6 should read :
'Virginia Godfrey said that it seemed to be that Heathrow was heading for total gridlock on local roads even with the public transport scheme'.

4126 MATTERS ARISING

(a) Minute 4112 – Traffic Congestion due to Control Posts

1. BAA made a presentation – Please refer to Minute 4133.

(b) Minute 4112 – BAA Property Market Support Bond Scheme – Heathrow Primary School – check if the school had been issued with Bonds.

1. The Chairman confirmed that a note from BAA had been tabled. This had indicated that the School did not qualify for a Property Market Support Bond as they were a Local Authority School and effectively a Public Building and would fall under Compulsory Purchase Order legislation.

The Property Market Support Bond Scheme was for individual residential properties.

2. Margaret Majumdar stated that she had not originally asked about the Property Market Support Bond Scheme. The question had been raised as to whether a discussion had taken place between BAA and LB Hillingdon regarding the Heathrow Primary School. The objective of this would be to ensure that everybody concerned was aware of what might happen on the whole subject in the future.

3. Ben Morton commented that BAA had obviously spoken with the LB Hillingdon on many issues surrounding this subject area. At present, they were still only proposals, and therefore at this stage, he had nothing further to add.

However, he would find out further information relating to the original question.

ACTION:
BEN MORTON

(a) Minute 4112 – nominate one HAL and one airline representative to join Working Party re: CAA ‘Improving the Air Passenger Experience’ Survey.

1. The Chairman of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee, Philip Carlisle confirmed that this issue was ongoing. Members from the Committee had been nominated to form a Working Party, but awaited the names of the HAL and airline representative.

2. Ben Morton stated that the PSSC were probably ahead of BAA on this matter. He had spoken with Kieran Hanks, BAA Director of Regulation, who had responded that he thought this was a good idea and that HAL would participate. However, at present, Mike Forster was the nominated representative, but he had not been dealing with all of the necessary legwork on this. Therefore, for the moment, HAL did not have an official nominated representative, but this would be actioned as soon as possible.

ACTION:
BEN MORTON

3. Philip Carlisle commented that it did strike him that there may be no rush on this matter. He thought that it might be better if the Committee’s Working Party made up their mind as to where its priority lies and then consulted with HAL, rather than perhaps having them in on this from Day 1.

Ben Morton agreed to this suggestion.

4. The Chairman asked if there was a deadline for this consultation.

Philip Carlisle responded that it has been established that the final deadline was in June 2008. The more interesting deadline was that the stakeholders would be consulted by the CAA before the end of April. As far as was known, as yet, there had been no indication from the CAA about such meetings with any stakeholders.

(d) Minute 4119 – Noise & Track Keeping Working Group – supply written report tracing its origin, who held responsibility for various aspects of the meetings and the Terms of Reference.

1. The Chairman said that he understood that as requested, Nita Easey had produced a report which was currently held with the Secretariat. However, this had not been released for circulation, as the Technical Adviser wished to submit his own report to accompany this.

2. The Technical Adviser said that this was correct. He thought that as the history surrounding the issue went back several years, it would not make any sense for the Committee to only hear one side of the argument.

As the amount of material that had arisen for the Committee meeting was so excessive on this occasion compared to usual, this had resulted in the onerous task of reading and selecting from 1500 pages of text. Therefore, it had not been possible to research the enormous mass of documentation on the NTKWG to extract the facts and figures on the debate.

However, one document readily available was a copy of a letter which had been sent in 1994 from the Managing Director of Heathrow at that time, Mike Roberts. It had stated that the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group was a Sub-Committee of HACC, but that this had become a little changed over the years. However, the full facts of the matter need to be established.

The Technical Adviser stated that a matter of concern to note (due to the run down and turnover in staff at BAA where there had been substantial cutbacks), was the fact that it was extremely difficult to know where to seek expert advice on environmental matters as used to be received by HACC, when there was a proper Environment Unit at Heathrow.

A report therefore needed to be put authoritatively before the Committee, following which the Members should consider how best the expert advice could be obtained, which at present was not known.

The Noise & Track Keeping Working Group (NTKWG) as it currently stood had refused to discuss some of the matters that had recently arisen e.g. ANASE Study and had left this to HACC to deal with. However, the Committee had no expertise available from which they could advise the Members. It was therefore a matter of considerable importance to the Committee and would be dealt with at the next meeting.

4127 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

(a) Royal opening of Terminal 5.

1. The Chairman confirmed that the Royal Opening of Terminal 5 had taken place on 14th March 2008.

Philip Carlisle had attended the Royal Opening to represent HACC.

(b) West Windsor Residents' Association – application for membership of HACC.

1. The Chairman advised that West Windsor Residents' Association had made an application for membership of HACC.

Iain Hope who represented the London Chamber of Commerce had written in to advise that he opposed this wholeheartedly because the Windsor & Maidenhead Council were already members of HACC. If the Committee started to introduce Residents' Associations from all around the airport, the membership would be too large.

However, it was the decision of BAA as to the composition of the Committee.

The Chairman stated that it was his view that the request should be politely declined.

2. Cllr. Beer pointed out that EANAG, which was an active Residents' Group from Ealing was a Member of the Committee. He thought that it was justifiable that a Residents' Association within an under-represented area should in fact be Members of the Committee.

There were Independents on HACC who did not represent anybody, although it was acknowledged that they did a good job. However, the people from the West Windsor Residents' Association did represent a substantial community and therefore their application was worthy of proper consideration.

The Chairman responded that with regard to the EANAG comparison, this was actually an anti-aircraft noise action group in Ealing. It was not a Residents' Association.

However, the final decision to this request would be made by BAA.

3. The Technical Adviser reminded the Members that at the beginning of 2005, the Committee and BAA were considering an application from the RB Windsor & Maidenhead for an extra seat on HACC. The Committee debated this at some length and advised BAA that they thought that it should be refused because the Committee was already large enough (43 Members).

The Technical Adviser explained that in previous years, a group named FANG (Federation Anti- Noise Group) were represented on the HACC. He read from a letter which listed the organisations that they represented. There were many Residents' Associations amongst them. FANG was a Member of HACC who represented all of those organisations. They subsequently merged with HACAN/Clearskies. There was therefore a means for these groups to be able to make representations either to or through the Committee.

HACC could not work on the basis that many Residents' Associations were also represented as Members. There had to be a cut-off point where there were organisations who were representative of many others, but could not be entitled to sit around the table. It would be impossible to deal with them.

4. The Chairman pointed out that on the question of Independent Members, the qualification to be appointed to the Committee was that they must be frequent flyers. That was another aspect of the Committee's workings.

However, the decision should be made by the Committee Members as to whether they wished to recommend the West Windsor Residents' Association to become part of HACC or not. It would then be up to Ben Morton and his team to make the final decision.

The Members were asked to vote on this.

Those in Favour - one Member.

Those Against - the majority of the Members.

(c) Annual meeting of Airport Consultative Committees to be hosted at Heathrow on 11th/12th June 2008.

1. The Chairman advised that the Annual Meeting of the Chairmen of the Airport Consultative Committees would be hosted this year by BAA Heathrow. This meeting consisted of approximately 25 airports represented by the respective Chairmen, Technical Advisers and Secretaries. A Business Day is scheduled to debate matters of concern.

4128 HEATHROW MANAGEMENT MATTERS

1. (a) Discussion on matters to be reported by BAA Heathrow management had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
(b) BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Mr. Mark Bullock said that it had been as busy a time as ever at Heathrow, particularly during the month of March.

The **Civil Aviation Authority** had made its announcement on **Pricing**, earlier in March. From the airport's point of view, it was pleased that this had now been finalised. Whilst BAA and the airlines may have views on whether they did or did not like some of the provisions that had been made in the final statement, at least they knew the plans for the next five years. Certainly, from the perspective of BAA, they knew what the airlines wanted and looked forward to working with them on the transformation of the airport.

3. The Chairman asked if there was not an Appeal.

Mr. Bullock responded that there was a possibility of a Judicial Review. It was known that some airlines had been quoted in the Press.

4. Mark Bullock stated that on 14th March 2008, the **Official Opening Of Terminal 5** took place attended by Her Majesty The Queen and a number of other dignitaries. The event went very well, with an appropriate celebration of the efforts of 60,000 people who had worked on that project.

The 27th March 2008 would see the important opening day for the passengers to come through Heathrow's Terminal 5 for the first time.

The first arriving flight to Terminal 5 was at present in the air, due to land on time. There were 186 bags in the early bag store already, waiting for departure.

A few days after the Official Royal Opening of Terminal 5, on 18th March 2008, the first arriving **A380 flight** came into Heathrow. This was hosted by the airline and attended by the Aviation Minister, Mr. Jim Fitzpatrick with other MPs and dignitaries. Again, this event went very successfully and BAA were pleased to welcome the A380 to Heathrow.

Mr. Bullock reported that the **new Chief Executive** of BAA, Mr. Colin Mathews had taken up his new role on Monday 17th March 2008. He looked forward to working with him as a colleague in the business. He was very much a man with a reputation for delivering a successful operation.

In terms of the **operational performance** itself, February 2008 saw a continued favourable trend in regard of security clearance, with 99% of the time that central search queues were less than ten minutes.

During the Easter Bank Holiday weekend in March, this was a very busy time for BAA and traditionally one of the busiest times of the year. Again, 99% of the time, the queues were less than ten minutes and 85% of the time, less than five minutes. This was a pleasing result.

The **Recruitment Campaign**, referred to often in the past continued. Obviously, the big requirement for staff would be for Terminal 5 and the recruitment of Security Officers would continue at pace until the end of May 2008, by which time BAA should be up to full strength in terms of looking towards these service standards which had been set for BAA by the CAA.

Another aspect that BAA had been working hard on was the **transformation activities** throughout the airport for the existing passengers.

Terminal 5 was the big event which would enable BAA to re-configure and refurbish the other Terminal buildings and create more space. Therefore, 2008 would be a big year, as not only did it bring Terminal 5, but it would enable the start of the transformation works, to the remainder of the Terminal buildings, which had already commenced.

By way of example, over recent weeks, in anticipation of the Heathrow East construction works starting at the end of this calendar year, BAA had started to divert some of the services, e.g. IT cabling, gas piping and electricity cables.

Last week the new **Terminal 3** Transfers Building was completed. During the next few weeks an additional security machine would be installed for the passengers

At **Terminal 4**, works would be obvious in the Car Park. BAA were extending the forecourt facilities and bringing the canopy out to extend the depth at the front of the building. This would be very similar to the work that had been completed at Terminal 3. These works were well underway.

The Welfare facilities were recently opened, with 400 construction workers. This was on a piece of vacant land, adjacent to the Car Park. Strengthening works had been carried out to the Car Park to take the traffic, once the work had finished. Although much of the work apparent was completed, there were still works in progress.

Work had also started on the construction of a new Premium Passenger Lounge in Terminal 4, together with work on the new A380 Bridges.

With regard to **Terminal 1**, at the end of 2007, a new Reclaim Belt was opened. Since October, 12,000 sq. metres of hard flooring had been laid. A further 24,000 sq. metres had yet to be laid as part of the programme to replace carpet with hard floor.

More recently, the new Zone R security area was opened with new security machines for the passengers.

On the **baggage front**, one of the important aspects for passengers was the ability to transfer their baggage between Terminals. A tunnel was being built to connect Terminal 1 through to Terminal 5 with a tunnel boring machine.

Work had also been carried out on a project on baggage handling facilities. A test facility had been developed in Belgium to trial new technology from other industries to see if it could enhance the performance at the airport, to both improve the service to the passenger and also hopefully to the airlines.

BAA had carried out much work with some of the airlines in terms of trialling new technologies. An example of this was the RFD (radio frequency identification) chip tags for baggage. This was for a proposed trial of printing baggage labels on a machine in self-service kiosks for the passengers.

A further example would be a trial technology where rather than present a boarding pass to an airline member of staff, a passenger would be able to place this through a machine.

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

5. Andy Hull referred to the diversion of services to Terminal 2. He asked if this was the overhead gantry 'mess' that was outside the Car Park. It was suggested that this might be labelled as a 'temporary structure' as it did not look very pretty with barbed wire.

Mark Bullock replied that he took this comment on board. He said that one of the points he was being very specific on with his construction colleagues was how they made works appear. He said that he would talk to the workers on this observation that had been made.

6. Margaret Majumdar referred to Terminal 5. She asked if Arrivals would be announced on BBC Ceefax. If so, on which page number would they appear.

Keith Harlow confirmed that it was page 445 on BBC Ceefax.

7. Ben Morton responded to the point that Andy Hull had made. He said that when BAA undertook works around the airport, they tried to tell the passengers the purpose of these and made them look good
8. John Gurney asked if it was true that BAA were suspending Service Quality requirements for Terminal 5.

Mark Bullock replied that this was not true.

9. John Gurney referred to the Planning Applications – P5 Car Park, Sealand Road on the South side of the airport. It indicated that this was a proposed Energy Centre. He asked if this was correct, as it was not very clear.

Mark Bullock replied that the Planning Application submitted in question referred to the development of Heathrow East.

10. Philip Carlisle referred to Security queuing. He said that the ‘Sunday Times’ had recently published an article which had suggested that the way the queue was being measured meant that the stats might be misleading. He asked for a comment on this matter.

Mark Bullock responded that he refuted that claim and rejected that the stats were incorrect. The business was planned and the queues were measured every fifteen minutes on operational days. A forecast of the number of passengers was made.

11. Geoff Pope referred to the Traffic figures which had appeared to be fairly static for the month of March. He said that the report stated that with the opening of Terminal 5 and the new ‘Open Skies’ era this would add North Atlantic capacity. He asked if there was an estimate available on the impact of traffic figures over the next year.

Mark Bullock responded that this information was available. This would be provided to the Secretary.

ACTION:
MARK BULLOCK

12. Paul Ellis said that it was very heartening to hear of the progress that had been made to turn around Heathrow. It had been a long journey to reach the opening of Terminal 5. It would be an exciting day which he looked forward to and on investment for the rolling progress thereafter.

Mr. Ellis said that he was looking for an assurance that BAA were ‘geared up’ in terms of resources and funding to press on with the Capital Investment Plan as agreed with the opening of Terminal 5, and indeed should a positive decision be reached which was hoped for and expected from the PSDH, there would be a swift move to mixed-mode and the development of the third runway at Heathrow.

Mark Bullock replied that BAA had previously stated that it intended to honour its commitments on the investment arising from the Capital Investment Plan. As featured in the Press reports, BAA were currently undergoing a stage of re-financing. That work was currently progressing with a team of financial experts and lawyers.

4129 MAKING THE CASE FOR RESPONSIBLE GROWTH

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.517**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. A copy of the BAA response to the Government’s Consultation document about a third runway and mixed mode operations at Heathrow Airport had already been distributed.

2. Virginia Godfrey stated that she was unhappy that the item had been placed on the Agenda. It was one response put forward by BAA. It was not right to do this. If one response was to be discussed, then responses from local authorities and other bodies should also be included.
3. Cllr. Wright agreed with this statement. If one response had been put forward, all responses should be seen.
4. The Chairman pointed out that BAA did run the airport and as such, were responsible for dealing with the Committee and its operation. It would be strange indeed if the Committee were not to see the response of the airport operator.
5. Virginia Godfrey said that she completely agreed and of course BAA were entitled to say what their views were. However, it was thought that everyone who wished to, should also be able to have a platform of ten minutes to discuss their response.
6. Philip Carlisle said that he thought it would be advantageous to all of the Members of the Committee to know the views which had been put forward by the airport owner and those responsible for keeping it going in whatever form in the future. As to whether the Members agreed with it or not was a matter for themselves. As far as all of the responses were concerned, it was understood that it was the job of the Department for Transport to weigh up the balance of all of these and make a decision.

In this particular case, it would seem too closely aligned to the business of the Committee not to have at least the summary of the response by BAA.

7. Ben Morton commented that as far as he was concerned, it was not the decision of BAA to put this item on the Agenda for discussion.
8. Paul Ellis said that certainly from IATA's perspective, it was very important to hear and understand the views of BAA on this consultation.
9. The Chairman said that it was his view that the Committee had to pay regard to the submissions that BAA make on many different matters, in order to keep abreast of events.

4130 LANDING AT HEATHROW OF A CHALLENGER 604 BUSINESS JET EXPERIENCING FLIGHT DIFFICULTIES

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.519**) about a further incident involving an aircraft in difficulties which was able to fly across Central London and land at Heathrow had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. A report by the Air Accidents Investigation Branch was extensively quoted.
2. The Chairman stated that the incident in question occurred almost three years ago. It had been brought to the attention of the Committee by the Chairman of the Farnborough Airport Consultative Committee, Mr. Philip Riley.

It was the recommendation of the Technical Adviser that the Committee should again protest to the Chairman of the CAA and to NATS that aeroplanes which were diverted in these circumstances should not travel over densely built-up areas.

This was agreed.

3. Cllr. Horn also suggested that ‘advice’ to the Pilots should be upgraded to ‘instruction’.

The Technical Adviser responded that this matter was previously raised with the Civil Aviation Authority. Due to the nature of International Agreements and some of the circumstances which affect these aircraft on occasions, it was not practicable for An Air Traffic Controller to ‘instruct’ a Pilot as to what he must do. The Air Traffic Controller was not in the cock-pit of the aircraft and could not appreciate the exact circumstances.

It was thought that what could be improved upon, was the dialogue between the Air Traffic Controller and the Pilot of the aircraft; to interrogate the latter more about the situation.

In this particular case, from the report studied, as the aircraft was not in immediate danger, it could have travelled to Gatwick Airport where the approaches to the runway were over much less densely populated areas.

The Technical Adviser said that he would not quibble with the comment made by the Chairman of the CAA, in that in the final analysis, it must be a matter for the Pilot. Only he knew what the aircraft would be capable of.

However, there was a case for more dialogue between Controllers and the Pilot of the aircraft to try and make sure that if they were not in immediate danger, they did take the most suitable alternative facilities available to them in all the circumstances.

In this instance, it was clear that there were five aerodromes that the aircraft could have flown to. In the event, for whatever reason decided, he wanted to come in to Heathrow. It may have been the case that he knew he did not have any flaps and needed as much space as he could get on the runway to get down and Heathrow happened to have the longest runway. The runway at Gatwick Airport was not that much shorter. However, the Pilot may have been so concerned that he felt he wanted every metre available to him.

It was thought that it was the correct decision in principle, but that the Controllers could and should do more by way of interrogating Pilots to establish if they could get them to use another airport.

4. The Chairman asked the Members if a reply should be sent on behalf of the Committee as described by the Technical Adviser.

This was agreed.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

4131 NEW RESIDENTIAL NIGHT NOISE INSULATION SCHEME FOR HEATHROW

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.520**) (together with an information pack from BAA) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

2. The Technical Adviser said that the information had been distributed to local residents on 22nd October 2007.
3. Cllr. Elengorn commented that the English grammar used in the letter supporting the information pack was incorrect. He thought that BAA would wish to rectify this for their reputation.
ACTION:
BEN MORTON
4. Virginia Godfrey said that the Scheme was good. It was the first time that the Secretary of State had realised what a huge area was affected as the map indicated and had taken on board the feelings of the community.

4132 IMPROVING PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESS TO HEATHROW AIRPORT – BAA RAIL AIRTRACK CONSULTATION

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.518**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. A copy of the BAA consultation document had already been distributed.
2. The Chairman advised that comments to the consultation would be welcomed by 25th April 2008.

The Technical Adviser had made two Recommendations on the second page of his Report.

It was thought that the Members of the Committee would no doubt wish to welcome the Scheme, although it was understood there were difficulties for Spelthorne and Staines.

The Chairman asked if the Members from those areas could relay their reservations on this subject.

3. Cllr. Argawal said that the main concern that his Surrey constituents had raised with him and he was aware that neighbouring Council colleagues had also raised, was on the subject of overhead electrification of the train's power.

Previously, in the original presentation, no mention was made of this and after submission by the Spelthorne Local Area Committee, the AirTrack Consultants agreed to go away and revise the document to make it clearer to local residents as to exactly what was being proposed.

At the last Local Area Committee meeting, the company explained exactly what they were proposing. They had agreed to take away and look at the possibility of a third rail system. However, they had outlined the difficulties of having a change-over from overhead electrification to third rail power within the existing box of the airport infrastructure. Therefore, the Council awaited to see the technical solution that would be arrived at.

It was not thought that the area residents or representatives were opposed to the scheme in principle. It was only this particular aspect around overhead electrification.

4. Cllr. Grant stated that a presentation was made at the Spelthorne Borough Council offices. There was no word of the overhead cables. It came as such a shock. The two presenters involved had argued as to whether they would show these or not in the presentation.

5. Cllr. Trussler said that he understood there was a huge cost involvement, in that the present electrification cannot be converted at one point. It was of great concern to learn that the electrification would be across the Moors. The presenters were going away to look at the possibility of trying to do it whilst trains were on the move. However, the current Heathrow Express could not be converted to third rail. The trains were not built to work on third rail.

Cllr. Trussler said that he did not hold out much hope of a solution being found to the problem regarding the overhead cables.

6. Cllr. Grant said that it would be horrendous to have overhead rails over Staines Moor.

7. Cllr. Horn pointed out that the change-over was carried out at Farringdon Station without any difficulty.

8. Cllr. Roberts said that Runnymede BC had also received a presentation after Spelthorne BC. Clearly, the overhead electrification was in the presentation. It was explained that they could not put third rail inside the box. They could manage the change-over at the exit to the box. This would mean that the part over Staines Moor was third rail.

As Cllr. Trussler had pointed out, this would include the Heathrow Express trains moving beyond Heathrow to Staines. There was a view that seemed to suggest that the flexibility and potential for further rail expansion might be advantageous and to have Heathrow Express extended to Staines rather than stopping at Heathrow.

It was thought that it was here where the decision actually lay, and whether a technical solution would be found to switch from third rail to overhead. This technically could be done, but then the only way that Heathrow Express could be extended to Staines, would be to change all of its rolling stock.

9. John Gurney stated that Heathrow Express did currently have carriages that could be used for either overhead or third rail, but it was the infrastructure on the Western route that was not suitable.

10. Cllr. Argawal responded to the point made by Cllr. Horn. He thought that the difference that was seen at Terminal 5 or any of the boxes relating to Heathrow, was around the concrete and what would happen in terms of earthing with the switchover from overhead talons to third rail.

Another concern expressed by the residents related to the noise and vibration of the rolling stock. At the last Surrey Local Area Committee meeting, the consultants were asked to look into the possibility of purchasing new rolling stock.

They had responded with a figure of approximately £50 million to do so.

However, they did outline that they may be able to part-exchange the existing rolling stock in the railways market to offset some of that cost.

It was thought that this would certainly be preferable that new and quieter trains, if they were to go across Staines Moor and Stanwell Moor were purchased, prior to the implementation of AirTrack.

11. The Chairman said that the comments of concern expressed by the Members, would be relayed back in the response.
12. The Technical Adviser asked for clarification from those Members who were concerned about the electricity supply. He asked whether it was a general wish that the Committee should represent that there should be third rail or overhead, as certain Members had spoken about the technical difficulties involved.

The Members advocated that it should be third rail.

13. Paul Ellis said that he disagreed with this. He thought that it should be overhead. It was a thoroughly excellent proposal. It was very important to have the flexibility to be able to run the Heathrow Express service. The aim was to get more people onto public transport.
14. Philip Carlisle said that he had received a consultation document on AirTrack. of which Cllr. Roberts had summed up the details. It clearly spelled out all of the alternatives. Given the proposed route, the point seemed to be whether the Heathrow Express should be extended further, in terms of third rail, followed by new rolling stock.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

4133 NEW AIRPORT FLIGHT PATHS PROPOSAL – CONSULTATION BY NATS

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.521**) of a very extensive proposal by the National Air Traffic Service to re-organise many of the flight paths operating from a number of aerodromes at and to the North of Heathrow had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Technical Adviser pointed out that fortunately, the consultation only referred to flight paths broadly to the North of Heathrow in the way it had been written. In the BAA document which had been discussed earlier, ‘Making a Case for Responsible Growth’ it referred to development of the South East Airspace Study. This was the first time that reference had been seen to this.

It was understood that the document that the Committee were now discussing on Terminal Control Paths dealt with the Control Paths broadly to the North of Heathrow, (also including Stansted, London City and Luton).

Heathrow had little change on the flight paths. Most of them in the areas that the Committee were concerned about were too close to the airport to really be noticeable. There was very little room for manoeuvre. The big changes would come further out.

It is expected that a further consultation document would be received in due course as part of the Airspace Study that BAA had referred to for the Terminal Control South. This would have many more implications for the interests represented on the Committee than the current consultation, as much more of the Greater London Counties area would be involved in that.

3. Margaret Majumdar stated as the Technical Adviser's Report pointed out that the main change would appear to be on Ealing. Information on page 4 had indicated that the Borough would be very badly affected because the flights paths for each existing runway were much closer together. Therefore, there was a greater concentration of noise when the Northern Runway was in use, as well.

It was surprising to note that the Technical Adviser had said that these were part of the changes that would be necessary for mixed-mode. It could not be seen how these proposed routes were right for mixed-mode, as they were far too close to the airport.

It was wondered whether this was connected with getting more flights in under the 'Open Skies' and Terminal 5 growth and another consultation would be published for mixed-mode from NATS similar to the 'Adding Capacity at Heathrow' document.

It was proposed that the Committee might say that there should not be a change in advance of any proposals for mixed-mode. All this would do was to make people have to get used to a different scenario overhead and then have to change again if mixed-mode was introduced. There did not seem to be a point in changing the situation at this stage.

Margaret Majumdar thought that the consultation was totally inadequate and she would not have known about it, if it had not been for the Committee papers. It was understood that NATS had sent one copy of the document to each Council. Certainly, it was most unlikely that anyone except the Officers who received the documents at the LB Ealing had been informed of it..

Clearly, the affect on the residents of Ealing would be huge. From a personal point of view, flights from the Southern Runway on the centre line would go straight over her property, instead of half-a-mile to the North. This would mean that aeroplanes would fly both sides of her house, instead of just the Southern tip of the route swathes overhead.

It would not only affect the residents of Ealing, but also people in parts of Hounslow, Isleworth, Brentford and Acton. There should be a wide consultation. There were a number of large schools which would be badly affected by this proposal, e.g. Elthorne Park School, Hounslow School in Gunnersbury and possibly Brentford School for Girls, in addition to numerous primary schools.

Margaret Majumdar suggested that the Committee should demand that NATS consulted much more thoroughly on any proposed changes, and that indeed there should not be changes at the present stage pending the outcome of the consultation 'Adding Capacity at Heathrow Airport'.

4. The Technical Adviser explained that the changes to the routes had no relevance to mixed-mode. It would be surprising if the residents of Ealing in fact noticed very much difference from the current routes.

Under the present set-up, aircraft did not operate from each of the runways at the same time. They operated from one or the other of the runways. All that was intended at that proximity to the airport was to try to tighten up a little on the routes. There may be a slight concentration in one area, but it would be only a matter of a few hundred yards.

In the way that aircraft noise spread, it was not thought that this would be more noticeable than currently experienced. It was agreed that it was noisy at present, but it was not thought that it would be any noisier in the future (unless mixed-mode was introduced).

5. Margaret Majumdar pointed out that this would depend where a person lived on the few hundred yard stretch. Certainly, the areas to the South around the Piccadilly Line Heathrow branch, which were on the edge of the swathe at present, would be very near to the centre line. It was accepted that it was noisy for people who lived two miles to the East, who were higher up, but it was not as noisy as Ealing. As the area of Ealing and Brentford in particular, would be badly affected, it was not thought that the Committee should let the matter drop.

6. The Chairman stated that the closing date for the consultation was the 22nd May 2008. He asked if it was known when the new routes would be implemented.

The Technical Adviser responded that NATS hoped to reach a decision in six months time.

7. The Chairman asked if there were any other Members with specific concerns for particular areas.

Cllr. Elengorn responded that the LB Richmond upon Thames did receive a presentation from NATS on the Boroughs that would be affected. It was made clear that this proposal was just for the current capacity.

8. Cllr. Beer commented that the RB Windsor & Maidenhead received an A3 leaflet from NATS. Most Councillors and Libraries also received these. Reference was made to the website to view the consultation document. However, the website was found to be dreadful.
9. Roger Wiltshire referred to the maps in the NATS consultation document showing preferential routes and different swathes. He said that the red colouring indicated the extension, whilst the yellow colouring indicated the reduction.
10. The Chairman asked the Members if they felt it would be helpful for a representative from NATS to attend the next meeting on 28th May 2008 to present on the consultation. He thought that they would probably accept a late submission by one week.

11. The Technical Adviser explained that every effort had been made by the Secretariat to secure a presenter from NATS to attend the March meeting, but to no avail. However, if there was an overwhelming demand, a further attempt could be made.

With a consultation of this scope, it was thought that with the thousands of organisations involved, NATS would be able to take late responses.

Therefore, he thought the question to be asked of the Members was whether they would like a representative from NATS to present at the next meeting or whether the Committee already had enough information to take a view of the proposals.

12. Margaret Majumdar said in the meantime, she would like the Committee to consider that they should state there should be no changes on the Preferential Routes whilst the question on expansion of the airport was still unknown.

Also, that there should be direct consultation, as was done to some extent for 'Adding Capacity at Heathrow Airport' to the residents in the areas most affected. The majority of people were not aware of the NATS consultation. The Councils would not have the means of informing everybody concerned.

13. The Chairman asked Roger Wiltshire if these changes were a direct result of the opening of Terminal 5.

Roger Wiltshire responded that this consultation related to improving the airspace to the North of London. It was not related to the opening of Terminal 5.

14. The Technical Adviser explained that NATS had said that in areas which were more remote from Heathrow and the other airports, they were trying to see if they could get flights dispersed over somewhat wider areas, with as far as possible, the fewest residents in them. This was not always possible, but it was the main objective of the NATS consultation. It was not linked to airport development. It was an environmental management matter by NATS to try and reduce the concentration of aircraft noise over some areas.

15. The Chairman summarised Margaret Majumdar's proposal, which she had suggested. A letter should be sent to NATS stating that there should be no alteration on the routes whilst there was major consideration being given to changes, at Heathrow in particular, which could impact significantly on air traffic movements. The few thousand residents who would be affected should have direct consultation.

16. The Technical Adviser stated that in regard to the last point, as it was estimated that there were 5-10 million residents who could be affected, it was not thought that it was a practicable proposition to consult with each and every one of them. The areas to which these proposals involve would stretch from Heathrow to East Anglia.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

4134 TRAFFIC CONGESTION DUE TO CONTROL POSTS

1. A presentation was made to the Committee by Martin Brown, BAA Heathrow Logistics (*enclosed*).

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

2. The Chairman explained that the reason that the presentation had been requested was due to the fact that two Members of the Committee, John Gurney and Cllr. Patrick Roberts had raised concerns about a particular Control Post which seemed to bring the airport to a standstill for lengthy periods.
3. John Gurney stated that Nick Dent, BAA Business Leader at Heathrow had gone through the plans with him eighteen months ago and yet nothing had changed to improve the situation.

Recruitment of staff had been referred to. This would appear to be ongoing. Each time a school holiday was scheduled, the area seemed to shut down. It had taken 45 minutes for staff to get through a Control Post into a Terminal. The Control Post for Terminal 5 had been built, but an X-Ray machine had not been installed. Every lane should have its own X-Ray machine. It was thought that the Control Post had been built too near to the perimeter of the road. As soon as several vehicles arrived, they struggled to get through.

Suggested solutions would be to improve the signage on the Perimeter Road to inform drivers not to travel down on the outside lane as they would be met with a long queue, but to stay on the left-hand lane.

At the roundabout, the line of the road could be adjusted to put a third lane in. This would enable the outside lane to become the queuing lane and the traffic could flow. These were simple remedies, but had not been actioned by BAA. The problem had been ongoing for two years and was worsening.

The benefit of the suggested Centres could not be seen for people, only the cabin crew who need to get off the coach and have their bags X-Rayed.

4. Cllr. Roberts explained that his business was situated in the Cargo Area. Therefore he had a vested interest in this debate. He said that the reason he had raised this issue on more than one occasion was due to the fact that Terminal 4 to the M25 was one of the busiest road access points of all the airport. However, invariably, it could take one hour to reach from one end to the other.

The reason was not because of cargo congestion, but due to the catering vehicles in a line one mile in either direction. It was firmly believed that there was a serious risk of a major accident on that stretch of road. People did get fed up waiting and pulled out of queues, and this had been seen to happen. The fact that this varied day-by-day and hour-by-hour was indicative of the fact that this was a people and management problem, not solely an infrastructure problem.

If it was solely an infrastructure problem the same queues would be seen day after day, which was not the case.

As stated, this was a serious issue that had to be addressed. It was necessary to keep part of the Perimeter Road free to allow passenger access on that route.

5. Paul Ellis stated that it was pleasing to note that it was the intention of BAA to get a grip on this issue, as it was also a very serious problem for the airlines. It clearly cost considerable money to have vehicles waiting in a queue to go through the Control Posts. It caused delays to the airlines as the catering and crew could not reach the aircraft. This sometimes meant that the flight was late departing because they could not get the aeroplane ready in time. It therefore had much more broader implications than the infrastructure of the Control Posts.

It was good that the problem was being addressed. However, twenty minutes would still not be good enough as a target time to get through to Airside. It was a very long time. The CAA had agreed to this timing. However, from the other side of the debate, this would need to be re-addressed.

It should be borne in mind that whilst these plans were being drawn up, thought should be given to prepare the next step, to halve again the target time to get through the Control Posts.

Martin Brown responded to the points made by the Members.

He said that whilst he could not talk about how the current stage had been reached, he could speak with authority on what he found when he took his position up.

Irrespective of where the Control Post was located, or who was accessing it, e.g. airline crew, buses, heavy construction traffic or airfield maintenance operator vehicles, BAA manned and treated the Control Posts in much the same light. Clearly, this did not work. There were very different processing needs and times associated with various groups at the airport.

It was hoped to develop the infrastructure, putting in the right people and processes and start to influence in a positive sense, different types of users to the airport, to flow through different areas in a different way.

The point was taken that twenty minutes was not an acceptable target to reach Airside in general. For a crew coach going through a designated lane at a scheduled time, if this could be guaranteed with a near certainty, this would be an ideal start. BAA would then better that process in time, for other users in different areas.

With certain sealed cargo and catering vehicles, that processing time was under two minutes.

6. Paul Ellis reiterated that twenty minutes was not an acceptable target time for cabin crew to reach the aircraft. It was expensive for the airlines and had to be improved upon.

Martin Brown responded that he agreed with the commercial view on this point.

The CAA had levied a twenty minute target for BAA. This meant that twenty minutes was acceptable for all users at any time.

The situation, particularly feeding into the Cargo Area and through to the Control Posts and the Southern Perimeter Road was clearly unacceptable.

Mr. Brown said that he had been out during the past few weeks at 5.30 a.m. and seen the congestion for himself and the impact this had on the people travelling to work and accessing Terminal 4, how the traffic lights worked and people getting into the wrong lanes.

That area was being focused on. Plans would be drawn up with a further detailed explanatory presentation made to the Committee in the future.

The comments that the Members had made were well recognised. It was accepted that congestion on the Southern Perimeter Road was totally unacceptable and was a major health and safety traffic accident waiting to happen, on top of the lost business to cargo and airlines.

John Gurney responded that this issue was relevant to Terminal 5 or Terminal 4. He said that he had a complete record of the timings of the blockages on the Southern Perimeter Road. It was regular occurrence.

At 7.00 p.m. there was gridlock on the Perimeter Road at the Beacon Roundabout. (CP24). However, other departments had decided to design and build the Royal Mail Centre, right at the corner of the Cargo Centre. Their vehicles were so large that they had a problem entering the area. By the construction of this building, a parallel road had been lost into the Cargo Village, where a queue line could be organised on Seeland Road which would enable the other entrance to Stirling Road to be kept clear.

John Gurney suggested that it would be beneficial for both him, Cllr. Roberts and Paul Ellis to hold a joint meeting with Mr. Brown to identify the problem areas. This was agreed.

7. Mr. Brown suggested that it might be appropriate for him to attend the May meeting of HACC to inform of detailed plans, to look at the West and South side of the airport and offer those plans for scrutiny and review as they mature, to see if the Members thought that they were fit for purpose.

The Chairman responded that from the Committee's point of view provided that continuous improvement was seen and the twenty minute target issue was addressed, this would suffice.

8. Philip Carlisle commented that a further discussion on this topic might be too detailed for the general interest of the Committee Members.

Three areas of direct concern had been identified. It was recommended that the dialogue continued with John Gurney, Cllr. Roberts and Paul Ellis as it was from this area that the pressure was coming from. The knock-on effect of solving their problems, would without doubt ease the problems that the passenger may or may not be experiencing in trying to get around the airport.

9. The Chairman agreed that the Secretary would provide the names and contact details of the three Members who were mainly concerned on this issue.

ACTION:
SECRETARIAT

(Secretary's Note):: Names and contact details were sent to Mr. Brown on 26th March 2008.

4135 ECONOMIC REGULATION OF HEATHROW AND GATWICK AIRPORTS 2008-2013 CAA DECISION

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.522**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. This summarised the more relevant parts for the HACC of this 300 page document which had been published by the Authority on 11th March 2008.
2. The Chairman stated that the point of this Paper was that the airlines thought that the prices which had been set were too high. BAA were of the opinion that the charges were not high enough, but would nevertheless continue with their plans.

4136 PROJECT FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF HEATHROW (PSDH)

1. A verbal update report by the Department for Transport on the work of the Technical Groups was made to the Committee.
2. David Gray reported that the technical work was completed, subject to matters arising from the consultation responses. The policy issues had been addressed in some detail by the Aviation Minister, Jim Fitzpatrick MP at the last meeting. With regard to recent Press coverage, the DfT wholly rejected accusations in the 'Sunday Times' that there had been any impropriety in the work carried out between the Department for Transport and BAA.

As Members were aware, the consultation period closed on 27th February 2008.

Some 4,700 people had visited the public exhibitions in December and January at the twelve venues.

As would be expected, many thousands of consultation responses had been received - through e-mails, letters, tick box questionnaires, response forms and submissions. The Department for Transport was in the process of logging the responses. Each and every submission, in whatever format, would be read and analysed. This process was expected to occupy at least the next couple of months.

In terms of decisions, Ministers were on record as having said that they hoped to reach a decision later this year. Obviously, much would depend on the nature of the responses.

At the time that any announcement was made, there would be a full summary of responses made available to the public, in the usual way, and responses would be available for examination.

It was not expected that there would be much to report to the Committee until such time.

3. Margaret Majumdar asked David Gray if he could indicate how many responses had been received by the DfT directly and how this compared to those sent to the consultancy in Harrow. Also, whether there was a proportion which had been rejected as an invalid response.

David Gray replied that he was not in a position to comment further on numbers. The responses totalled tens of thousands, but he could not be more explicit. As to 'invalid' responses; every response was valid, provided it was submitted on time. The exercise was being taken very seriously but the DfT had made it clear in the consultation document that they would not take late responses into account.

4137 CAA SUBMISSION TO COMPETITION COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF BAA

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.523**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Technical Adviser said that the CAA had made this submission to the Competition Commission. It had emphasised that it wanted to consult with Consumer Groups.

It was thought desirable that a letter should be sent to the CAA to say that the Committee had noted this with interest and looked forward to an opportunity of discussing these measures with the CAA.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

4138 HOUSE OF COMMONS TRANSPORT COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE FUTURE OF BAA

1. The Technical Adviser's summary of the report (**HACC. 524**) together with the House of Commons Transport Committee List of Recommendations had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman asked if the Members were satisfied with the Conclusions as drawn in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Technical Adviser's Report. If so, a letter could be drafted accordingly.
3. The Technical Adviser said that it would be of benefit if the airline representatives could voice their opinions on the Recommendations for an Appeal Body.

Roger Wiltshire responded that he thought that the Recommendations were good. However, the proposals for this issue needed to be very clear. It was suggested to 'hold fire' on this matter until further clarification was seen.

4. The Technical Adviser advised that the Government had to come back in a set period, which was understood to be a couple of months, with their response to the points that the Transport Committee had raised.

The Report distributed by the House of Commons Transport Committee contained a copy of the Evidence that had been taken from a variety of people. However, it was not thought that some of those who considered such matters understood what was involved and how complicated the situation was, particularly in London, and at Heathrow where it acted as a hub airport, in relation to competition. They seemed to take a rather simplistic view about the opportunities for doing that, given all the ranges of airline partnerships of the passengers' desires and of transfer services.

5. The Technical Adviser drew attention to paragraph 6 of his Report This referred to an expansion of the role of the Air Transport Users' Council (AUC) which was represented on the HACC, by Lynette Braithwaite.

It was felt that the Committee had experienced a somewhat uneasy relationship with the AUC until about twelve years ago, where there was a certain amount of vying for position or antagonism between the two bodies.

The Technical Adviser continued that several discussions had been held between himself, the Chairman of HACC at that time and the Chairman and Chief Executive of the AUC. An agreement was reached that the best way forward was to appointment a representative from the AUC on the HACC.

The Technical Adviser said that on the last occasion that they had a Session with the House of Commons, he had pointed out to the Chairman, Mrs. Gwyneth Dunwoody, that the Airport Consultative Committees existed to deal with airport passenger problems. He had then been under the impression that when that Committee was considering matters such as the subject of this Report, that they would be drawing on the Consultative Committees experience in this field.

However, it had not happened in this case. The AUC were the only organisation that they had dealt with. This would indicate that the Transport Committee had significantly overlooked some of the concerns of airport passengers.

In the Conclusion, Item 9 of the Report, it had been suggested that a letter should be written to the House of Commons Transport Committee to inform them that the HACC would be very happy to assist them with information in any other aviation surveys or reports which they were undertaking.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

6. Lynette Braithwaite stated that although she could not comment on the past relationship, but it was her understanding that the AUC very much appreciated and welcomed the support of the Technical Adviser and the Committee.

The AUC had not and did not make itself out to be the only forum for discussion of passenger issues. It was a consultant and as such, that was its role within the CAA. The AUC 's activities and funding was limited.

4139 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 30th January 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.
2. The Chairman of the PSSC Philip Carlisle referred to the presentation received at the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting on the morning of 26th March 2008 by BAA, on the increased role of **Service Quality Rebates** and an explanation of how they were expanded (*enclosed*).

Philip Carlisle said that this had left him with two questions. There were several targets which had yet to be agreed with the AOC. The PSSC members would like to know what these were once they were agreed.

More importantly, if BAA did really well, they would receive money back, rather than pay the airlines.

The Committee would like to know where this money would come from, as it could not be seen that airlines would pay this. It was presumed that this would be taken from the public purse as it could not be from BAA's own money.

With regard to **Taxis**. The use of the 'Fares Fair' scheme in its new six-week trial had increased by 300%. The actual figure was derived from a rise of 20 journeys per day to 60 journeys per day.

This was welcomed. It was hoped that when the decision was taken following a review of the trial in April, that BAA would be able to continue with this or a modified form, and at that stage fully publicise it to the local residents, who might best get some value from knowing that it existed and insist on the implementation of the scheme.

It was also reported that the Taxi Marshals were now usually, talking to a passenger to promote the 'Fares Fair' scheme before they actually reached a taxi driver. By way of this, there was a third party assisting the passenger to decide whether 'Fares Fair' was appropriate. It was thought that this would reduce some of the risk of the passengers being dumped at the roadside or overcharged. This was a step forward.

In relation to **ID Cards**. The Members may have seen in the Press that those holding Airside passes, according to the Government, would be the first people to receive National ID Cards.

It was not understood why this was the case, other than the fact that there were so many checks made on Airside pass holders, that they would be easier to give an ID Card to than anybody else in society.

Philip Carlisle said that it would be his own personal preference that for those enforcing the security, i.e. the Metropolitan Police Force and Security Officers, that they should have to undergo the same procedure as Airside pass holders to see how many of those were justified in holding a National ID Card before we were policed by them.

For those Members of the Committee who held Airside passes, but did not use them very often, because of a new, no exceptions standard which had been introduced by the Department for Transport, everybody would need to undergo General Security Awareness Training (GSAT) and pass an examination by the end of January 2009.

It was understood the training could be completed on-line, albeit in-house, within the perimeters of the airport.

If it was necessary for the Airside pass holders on the Committee to take the examination, it should be made as easy as possible.

As the training was relevant to Security Awareness, the question was asked how valid the Members were as a target for that qualification. However, if the DfT could not amend its rules and there was no flexibility, the Committee would need to undergo the training, in order to be able to continue with its work.

ACTION:
BEN MORTON

3. Roger Wiltshire commented that in relation to the National ID cards, the airlines were given three days notice of the proposal.

It would be ironic if the Airside workers obtained the necessary National ID Card and then the rest of society did not require this, when it was to become compulsory in 2010.

4140 HEATHROW TERMINAL 5 - BUS SERVICES

1. Publicity produced for TfL bus services changes connected with the opening of Terminal 5 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Roger Wiltshire suggested that in relation to the T5 bus services, as the traffic was bad on the South side of the airport, BAA should consider re-routing the buses.

The Chairman responded that he thought that this was a very good point. He asked Ben Morton to take this action away to report to the relevant team.

ACTION:
BEN MORTON

3. Cllr. Argawal said that the communications with regard to the T5 bus services was good from Transport for London. However, there seemed to be a lack of publicity and co-ordination with transport for Surrey, in particular on the 441 bus route that many people used to commute to the airport.
4. Rob Gibson pointed out that this information was on the LB Hounslow website.
5. Philip Carlisle commented that to support BAA, the depth of material from TfL which had been produced was numerous and voluminous.

However, Surrey had a problem in that it was understood that most of the services, particularly the lack of any direct service to T5, was a bone of contention.

6. Cllr. Argawal clarified that the 441 bus service which ran through Surrey would serve Terminal 5, but there had been a lack of publicity on the proposed changes to the route.

ACTION:
BEN MORTON

7. Andy Hull commented that he was amused to note that there was an erection of a scale model of an Emirates 380 on the Concorde Roundabout. No doubt it would be known as the A380 Roundabout in future.

4141 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for January and February 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. The Technical Adviser drew the attention of the Committee to the second application on page 4, which referred to a 2.1 km long underground transfer baggage tunnel. Most Members would be aware that there had been a baggage tunnel already in existence for some years between Terminal 4 and Terminal 1.

This was a massive extension of that transfer facility, which should result in an improvement for transferring passengers and on the internal roads on the Airside of the airport, by reducing the amount of traffic.

No doubt the Committee would welcome the proposal, which it was hoped would soon be in existence.

4142 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for Quarter 4 (October-December 2007) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4143 NEWS RELEASES

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

4144 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. The Chairman stated that Rob Gibson had asked if clarification could be sought regarding the provision of information to HACC from the ANMAC (Aircraft Noise Monitoring Advisory Committee) of the Department for Transport.

The Chairman said that he had attended the last meeting of the ANMAC Committee where he had specifically asked for a report to the next meeting in July, indicating precisely the information that could be made available to other parties.

Approximately six years ago, the Head of that particular Branch of the Department for Transport was very cautious about information being released into the public domain.

However, it was thought that the new Head of Aviation would be more relaxed about the sharing of information as the Freedom of Information Act had changed the situation.

Rob Gibson thanked the Chairman for this update.

2. The Technical Adviser commented that it had always been the practice within the Committee to publish the Minutes of the ANMAC meetings when they were agreed. However, a meeting of ANMAC had not been held for several years. He had pressed the Department for Transport's Aviation Environmental team about this, as a result of which, a meeting was held at the beginning of December 2007.

The Minutes of that meeting were produced in Draft. It was thought that these were subsequently approved at a meeting held in March, attended by the Chairman of HACC. However, a confirmed copy of those Minutes had not yet been seen. If and when these Minutes are received, in accordance with the normal practice of the Committee and that which was understood from the Chairman of ANMAC, was acceptable, these should be available for publication and distribution.

3. The Chairman pointed out that it was some of the reports which were written for ANMAC that had a restriction on further publication.
4. The Technical Adviser continued that some of the papers which were released to ANMAC were produced by a Section of the Civil Aviation Authority which dealt with aircraft noise. These were put forward as working papers for discussion within the Committee and not as public documents. It was for this reason that the Department for Transport had always taken the view that they were not for publication, although they did not have an objection to the Minutes being distributed.
5. **(Secretary's Note):** A copy of the response of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC) to the Government's consultation document on the possible construction of a third runway is *(enclosed)*.
6. There were no further items to discuss and the Chairman closed the meeting.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:-
WEDNESDAY 28th MAY 2008**

