

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 28th May 2008 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Felicity Barwood	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Martin Elengorn	-	LB Richmond on Thames
Cllr. Jim Maddan	-	LB Wandsworth
Cllr. Phillip Bicknell	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Christopher Turrell	-	Bracknell Forest BC
Cllr. Trevor Egleton (Deputy)	-	Bucks County Council
Cllr. Patrick Roberts	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Balvinder Bains	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Dev Dhillon	-	South Bucks District Council
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos	-	Surrey County Council
Murad Qureshi	-	London Assembly
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
Paul Ellis	-	IATA
John Gurney	-	TUC
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Colin Mitchell	-	Independent
Mako Mochizuki	-	Independent
Susan Laurie	-	Independent

OTHERS

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

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Terry Morgan	-	Interim Managing Director
Ben Morton	-	Director of Communications

PRESENTERS

Clive Grant	-	NATS
Kathy Wood	-	NATS
Kevin Briscoe	-	NATS

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

1. Susan Parsons (ABTA), Lynette Braithwaite (AUC), Roger Wiltshire (BATA), Cllr. Mo Khursheed (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Graham Horn (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Paul Buttivant (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Chris Wright (London Councils), Mike Walsh (Independent), Philip Carlisle (GTMC).

4145 A PRESENTATION BY THE NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ON ITS PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES TO FLIGHT PATHS IN THE AREA OF TRAFFIC CONTROL NORTH (TCN)

1. A team of three members of staff from NATS gave a presentation in a private session, attendance at which was restricted to Members of the Committee. NATS had stipulated that they would not speak in a session open to the public and had, as a result, been given an assurance that no report of their presentation would be made public, although Committee Members views would clearly be influenced by what they heard.

A copy of a Minute of the NATS presentation will be attached to the record copy of the Minutes of the remainder of the meeting.

4146 NEW MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AT HEATHROW AIRPORT

1. BAA Direct Airwaves - Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.525**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

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.
2. The Chairman introduced Mr. Terry Morgan, Interim Managing Director at Heathrow until September 2008.

It was explained to the Members that Mr. Morgan had previously been the Managing Director at Stansted Airport and had worked with their Consultative Committee and understood their function. However, at Heathrow the post of the MD was now to be purely operational. Strategic and other matters were covered elsewhere. It had therefore been agreed that at future HACC meetings, the appropriate BAA staff would be fielded, depending upon the items on the Agenda,. Operational matters would be covered by Mr. Morgan's successor, Mr. Mike Brown, who would be briefed on the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

The Chairman asked Mr. Morgan if an article could be placed in 'Airwaves' (the magazine for BAA employees) to illustrate the workings of a Consultative Committee. This was agreed.

ACTION:
TERRY
MORGAN

The Chairman announced that the May meeting would be the last attendance at HACC for Ben Morton, BAA Director of Communications, as he was leaving the company, with all good wishes for his future career.

3. Mr. Morgan stated that Mr. Colin Matthews had joined BAA as Chief Executive in April 2008. He had very quickly decided that as far as he and his BAA team were concerned, much more direct time and effort should be put into thinking and working on the Heathrow story and the management challenge.

Mr. Matthews therefore decided to effectively collapse the BAA Executive into Heathrow, so that it would become more directly accountable for managing the function of Heathrow.

He had decided that the role of the Heathrow Managing Director should become much more focused on operational day-to-day delivery, which was a huge undertaking in its own right. Therefore, the Managing Director would effectively become a Chief Operating Officer of the airport. He had reporting to him all of the Terminal Directors and a number of other direct reports, principally Airside Operations and manpower planning.

As a result of that, Mr. Mark Bullock had decided that because the role of the Airport MD had changed quite substantially from the role that he had been appointed to, he would prefer to move on to other challenges and left the company at the beginning of May 2008.

The new Chief Operating Officer who would join BAA in September 2008 was Mr. Mike Brown. He was currently Chief Operating Officer of London Underground. He had a vast experience of managing complex operations and large numbers of people.

The issues of Strategic Planning and Development would sit with Mr. Mike Forster, formerly the technical and planning Strategy Director for Heathrow. He had now taken this position up for the whole of the BAA Group and was currently concentrating very much on Heathrow.

Mr. Morgan said that he would encourage both Mr. Mike Brown and Mr. Mike Foster to attend the HACC meetings when planning matters were discussed.

Essentially, the functions of Communications, HR and Finance which previously had individual Heathrow Directors had now all been taken over by the Corporate Directors. Hence, the decision made by Ben Morton to leave the company, with Mr. Tom Kelly Group Corporate Communications Director, picking up the reins for Heathrow.

Essentially, it was much more corporate focused onto the Heathrow operation. There would be a separate Managing Director at other airports within the BAA Group. Mr. Matthews would also set a new Executive for these as well.

Therefore, whilst it was not exclusively focused on Heathrow, the BAA Executive would spend much time and thought on the Heathrow development plan.

Mr. Morgan reported that **operationally** BAA were heading into the busiest period of the year. The Whitsun weekend had also been extremely busy and the operation in all of the terminals was running very smoothly.

The results were now being seen of a very major recruitment campaign that had been conducted over the past 18 months, to appoint in excess of 1,000 additional Security Officers. They were all now trained up and working in the terminals. The positive results of that were now being seen, with the very much shorter queue times that the passengers were now experiencing at Security checkpoints.

Terminal 5 had opened on 27th March 2008 amongst problems, resulting from a combination of a number of relatively minor glitches which had compounded into an operation that both BAA and British Airways were disappointed with on the first day.

Today, the terminal was operating very smoothly and they had returned to normal function within four days of opening.

Mr. Morgan said that from his experience of major infrastructure projects at the airport it would be almost unique for a new terminal opening without a few glitches. Terminal openings in Hong Kong, Kuala Lumpur, Vancouver and Montreal had opened large airport terminals, with the disruption caused taking months to rectify, not days.

The Quality Service Monitor System (QSM) existed where passengers were asked to rate the quality of service on 30-40 different items as they travelled through the airport. The April 2008 results had been received for the airport.. Terminal 5 had scored very highly in the passengers ranking.

As a result of the opening difficulties, there had been a revised set of airline moves. The original plan was that British Airways was the Sole Tenant of Terminal 5 and they would transfer the majority of their routes from Terminal 1 and Terminal 4 into Terminal 5 by the end of May 2008.

Terminal 5 now handled all of the services which had previously been operating from Terminal 4 and also some long-haul services.

An announcement would shortly be made that British Airways and BAA had jointly agreed that the planned move of services from Terminal 4 would actually occur in three separate phases.

The first phase would occur on the 5th June 2008, when British Airways would transfer approximately 25% of their core operations out of Terminal 4 into Terminal 5.

This would be consolidated. Operations would run through a busy Summer, following which approximately 50% of their terminal services would be transferred on 17th September 2008. The remainder would transfer in October 2008, the date of which is yet to be announced. At that point, all of the Terminal 4 British Airways services would be in Terminal 5.

BAA believed that this would be the most suitable method to follow. To move substantial numbers of passengers, airlines and groups from one terminal to another in the middle of the Summer period would be a tricky operation.

British Airways thought that it would be a sensible solution to delay the majority of the move until after the Summer period.

However, this had consequential knock-on effects because the re-development programme for Heathrow was very complex. It involved moving in excess of 80 airlines around the airport in order to make room for the re-development to occur, particularly in Terminal 4.

BAA were encouraging the process of understanding what the knock-on effects of not moving airlines out of Terminal 4 would be. The details had not been completed yet. It would inevitably mean that the original programme would slip by months, but not years.

In terms of the work to Terminal 4 and moving traffic out of Terminal 2 into Terminal 4 and knocking Terminal 2 down in order to make way for the new terminal (Heathrow East), that programme would probably be delayed by approximately seven months. BAA were currently working this out with the airlines. A briefing would be provided to the Committee as progress was made,

Mr. Morgan said that one of the priorities for the BAA Management Team was to finalise the various **Competition Commission** Reviews that were currently being undertaken, particularly the review on the structure of BAA.

Members would be aware that the Competition Commission published a document entitled 'Emerging Thinking'. This was their first thoughts on some of the issues that they had been considering.

It would indicate that the Competition Commission seemed to be leaning towards a recommendation that BAA disposed of one or more of its airports. BAA had strongly argued that this solution would not actually tackle the problem being addressed. Even the Competition Commission recognised that effective competition between the airports would only happen if each of those airports had spare capacity in order to entice new and different airlines to their airports.

None of BAA London airports currently had spare capacity. Therefore, the solution of selling airports would not solve the problem. The debate continues and the Competition Commission will announce their findings in September 2008.

Mr. Morgan said that in the meantime, both himself and the BAA management team at Heathrow would concentrate on ensuring that everybody who passed through the airport over the Summer had a seamless and comfortable journey.

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

4. Iain Hope said that he was delighted to see a Notice Board in Terminal 5 which asked passengers 'Are You In the Right Terminal'. There were also staff on hand to assist passengers if they were puzzled by the situation.

The Notice Board also listed the long-distance operations which had transferred over to Terminal 5, but did not list further information regarding the proposed timetable for the further moves.

Mr. Hope asked if it was possible to produce a paper fold-out sheet with the information that had been outlined to the Members, so that the regular travellers at least, were forewarned of the further moves and the changes from the original plans. It was felt that this was very important.

Ben Morton responded that BAA had a campaign entitled 'Check Which Terminal'. There was an ongoing maintenance programme advertising on airport and also outside the airport at the happening news. Approximately 7-10 days prior to the move, this would be accelerated. This was planned for the whole of the programme of airline moves. This had been ongoing since Terminal 5 opened.

5. Mr. Morgan commented that Mr. Hope had made a very good point. BAA had an extensive communications campaign. However, the delay at switching some flights out of Terminal 4 would potentially be misleading. Therefore, both British Airways and BAA were very alert to the fact that as much communication as possible needed to be put out, because they would be operating on a split operation. It was important that passengers on specific routes knew whether to go to Terminal 4 or Terminal 5.

Ben Morton added as an example, that on 30th April 2008, which was meant to be the date that the remainder of British Airways relocated to Terminal 5, they estimated that apart from the fact that communication had been made by e-mail and direct mail to passengers, approximately 3,000 people arrived at Terminal 5 who should have gone to Terminal 4. BAA had laid on bus shuttles and tried to do as much as possible. In the Terminal FID screens were displayed.

6. Cllr. Bains asked firstly, how BAA would cascade information to the confused passengers who had booked tickets 4-5 months ago to travel from Terminal 5 that they now had to fly from Terminal 4.

Secondly, with regard to queue times, BAA had stated that they had gone down. However, was this a true picture?

Mr. Morgan responded that BAA had a standard across the airport that passengers would queue for no longer than five minutes for 95% of the time, which was a difficult target to achieve. However, BAA had achieved this consistently for much of April and May 2008. Some of the targets in early April were missed due to the disruption caused by the opening of Terminal 5. However, most of the targets were reached.

BAA were penalised financially if they missed the targets and had to pay back to the airlines a percentage of money, if the queue targets were not met. The targets were now being published in the terminals themselves. As a passenger went through the Security checkpoint, the performance of security queue times for that terminal should be displayed. This was an ongoing feature of the communications package.

With regard to how BAA had contacted the passengers who had already booked, a large element of that would be the responsibility of British Airways, to make contact through the web or personally, if possible. If a passenger did arrive at the wrong terminal, a fleet of buses were available to take people to the correct terminal. Hopefully, whilst regrettable, the inconvenience would be minimised.

7. Andy Hull said that it had been stated that the knock-on effect of all the delays might mean that the start of the Heathrow East Terminal development would be put back. It was understood that there was an expectation that this would be completed for the 2012 Olympics. The question was asked if this was likely to slip now.

Terry Morgan responded that this was probable, although every effort would be made to ensure that some part of the arrival flow HET facility would be available in time for the opening of the Olympics. That was still the aspiration. However, it had been made clear to the Olympic Authorities from the outset, that HET would not have been completed in time for the 2012 Olympics.

8. John Gurney asked if it was correct to the reference made that all of the remaining flights from T3 would go to Terminal 5.

Terry Morgan replied that this was correct.

9. Cllr. Saliagopoulos commented that she had travelled twice through Terminal 5 which had proved to be a good experience which could not be faulted, compared to travelling through Heathrow last year.

However, it is the practice for 100% shoe removal at the Security checkpoint. At Athens Airport, passengers are not required to remove their shoes. The question was asked why Heathrow Airport had made this compulsory.

Mr. Morgan responded that the Regulations surrounding Security at BAA Airports were determined by the Department for Transport. This was a Branch known as TRANSEC (Transport Security Department).

They informed BAA accordingly of the necessary set procedures for the passengers to pass through Security. By and large, those Regulations were standard across Europe, but the UK Government had the discretion to vary the European Union Regulations.

One of the variations was the shoe removal rule. Essentially, this was because there was a Risk Assessment carried out by the Government. Based upon this, they would determine the measures that BAA had to employ. They believed that there was a risk that a passenger could put liquid explosive in their shoes and pass through the Archway. The Archway was designed to detect metal, not non-metal. It was for this reason that BAA had to put a proportion of shoes through the X-Ray, which could detect explosives in the liquid form.

10. Keith Harlow referred to the Heathrow Report where it was interesting to note that more than 1,000 additional Security staff had been employed.

In the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee held on the morning of 28th May 2008, the Members had dealt with a range of issues concerned with the customer service aspect of the Security process, including complaints sent into the Committee.

Mr. Harlow asked Mr. Morgan what BAA were doing to improve the customer service experience at Security.

Mr. Morgan replied that the passenger security screening process was a very difficult balance. BAA had to strive between good passenger service and being effective to ensure that nothing passed through to Airside that should not.

As BAA did not want queues, they had encouraged Security Officers to be brisk in the process, but at the same time, they did not wish them to miss points. However, the two did not always go together very well.

Much training, support and coaching was given to the Security staff to enable them to do a thorough job, but at the same time to provide good customer service.

BAA were undertaking a major revamp of the Security facilities. New X-Ray machines had been installed which were much more effective. This allowed passengers to keep their laptops in their bag without removal. It made the area look more professional, which re-assured the passenger that the operation was of high quality, but at the same time that they were not being inconvenienced.

The most noticeable improvement was the queue times. The capacity had been increased with more machines and staff. Passengers were able to pass through Security in a relatively predictable time.

The one area which continued to be a challenge for BAA, was the fact that for a proportion of passengers it was necessary to carry out a body search. Staff did not particularly like to do this and the passengers did not necessarily like being on the receiving end. The search had to be thorough, but conducted in a polite way.

On the Quality Service Monitor Reports, BAA carried out a number of measures on Security, e.g. the queue time, which was important. However, passengers were also asked how friendly the staff were and how thorough and reassuring the process was. This gave a very good measure as to whether BAA were striking a good balance. By and large, BAA received good feedback.

Keith Harlow continued that whilst it was accepted that not all people were model passengers, the vast majority of the issues received into the PSSC were complaints about the attitude and aggressive behaviour of the Security staff.

Terry Morgan responded that he accepted that BAA had not yet got this 100% right in this area. The vast majority of passengers were very courteous and co-operative. However, there was a small minority who were difficult to deal with. Sometimes the staff reacted in an incorrect manner.

Keith Harlow said that many of the complaints received could not be traced back to a specific individual, as the Security staff did not carry an identity number or a name badge and were therefore not resolved due to that reason.

In most of the service industries it was possible to identify a point of contact. However, it was understood that it was the policy of BAA not to release the name of the member of staff.

Mr. Morgan responded that this was a matter that would be re-addressed by BAA. For some of the Security staff, because of the nature of the job, they felt somewhat reassured that their personal details were not revealed. However, wherever possible a Supervisor was based at the Security checkpoint, so that if a passenger did have a problem either the Officer could refer that problem to the Supervisor, who normally were identifiable with a name badge.

11. Cllr. Maddan asked Mr. Morgan if he wished to comment on the report in 'BBC Business News Today', which had stated 'that the airport operator BAA had claimed higher security costs after making a loss during the first few months of the year. BAA had reported a pre-tax loss of £62 million, compared with a profit of £89 billion for the same period last year'.

Mr. Morgan replied that it was very true that BAA had incurred substantial additional security costs, largely as a result of the changes in Regulation since September 2006. Across the entire Group, tens of millions of pounds worth of additional security costs had been spent, which were principally staff costs.

12. The Technical Adviser stated that there was yet again, an increase in the number of complaints received into the Passenger Services Sub-Committee from passengers about the attitude of Security staff. It had been a recurring theme at the reluctance of the Security staff, which was sometimes backed-up by their Supervisors. not to divulge their names, so that the passenger could include this in their written complaint.

The Chairman of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee, Philip Carlisle, acting on the agreement of the Members of the Committee, would write to BAA accepting that there was a problem in pinning a name badge to staff, but that it was recommended that a numbered badge was issued.

In this way, the Security staff would remain anonymous, as far as the public was concerned. This would give some back-up to the complaints which were being made, to enable them to be investigated in more detail.

ACTION:
PHILIP
CARLISLE

4147 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting held on 26th March 2008 were agreed with the following amendments:-

1. John Gurney referred to Minute 4132, Item 9. He said that Heathrow Express should read South West Trains.
2. Andy Hull referred to Minute 4140, Item 7. He said that this should be under 4140 Planning Applications, instead of Terminal 5 Bus Services.
3. Margaret Majumdar referred to Minute 4133, Item 15 & 16, relating to NATS, which was not elsewhere on the current Agenda when it came to making a response. From memory, paragraph 15 came after paragraph 16. It was thought that the Committee had agreed that there should be a submission made to NATS about the lack of consultation documents available to the residents.

At the same time, Mrs. Majumdar asked what the Committee proposed to do about making a response by the 19th June 2008.

The Technical Adviser responded that Mrs. Majumdar's memory was correct. He said that since he had managed to arrange the presentation with the attendance of NATS at the meeting of today, he had hoped it would affect or reflect the response from the Committee. As Members were aware, the consultation closing date had been extended from the end of May until 19th June 2008.

However, the Technical Adviser said that the problem arose as to the response to draft on behalf of the Committee, as he did not believe that the changes which were talked about were as disastrous as Margaret Majumdar seemed to think.

As yet, not all of the views of the Members of the Committee had been considered to put in a response, as only one or two opinions had been expressed.

4. The Chairman stated that Virginia Godfrey on behalf of HACAN Clearkiies and Margaret Majumdar representing EANAG were making very strong representation on behalf of residents living in the West, about the lack of consultation and the adverse affect, as were the representatives from LB Hounslow.

The Chairman asked if there were any Members who took a different view.

5. Keith Harlow responded that although he did not particularly take a different view, he pointed out that in the consultation process, when it came to consideration, clearly those who were adversely affected by its proposals would be well understood.

Having looked at the footprint plan from the presentation made by NATS, it looked as if those who would benefit would probably outnumber those who were adversely affected.

6. Cllr. Roberts said that he agreed with the comment made by Keith Harlow. The Committee was not fully representative of the Noise Action Groups from the Boroughs immediately around the airport, against those who would benefit.

Whilst there was sympathy for those who would be adversely affected due to the proposed changes, for the Committee to be tied into the views of the minority was not a representative response.

7. Margaret Majumdar asked if it was possible to form a response which stated that there clearly would be residents living close to the airport who would be badly affected and that the Committee felt that there should be more consultation of those people.
8. The Chairman asked if the Members were in agreement with this suggestion. This was agreed.
9. The Technical Adviser referred to the figure of 40,000 additional people who it was suggested would be affected by the new NATS proposals. He said that it would be helpful to establish the basis as to how this calculation was reached.

Rob Gibson responded that the NATS presentation had illustrated a map with reference to the ANASE Study. The calculation was derived on the areas in Hounslow with the number of houses x 2.

10. The Technical Adviser commented that whilst there may be 40,000 people living in those areas in Hounslow, that was not to say that all of those people would be very badly affected by the changes. Many people would take no notice of them, some were very badly affected. This did tend to give the wrong impression.
11. Cllr. Potts pointed out whether there were many people or not, they would still be affected, as would certainly be their health.
12. Cllr. Bicknell said that arising from these proposals there clearly would be winners and losers. The winners had experienced the aircraft, whereas the new people had not. That was the difference. It was for this reason that it was so significant to those areas.
13. The Chairman suggested that the response on behalf of the Committee would follow the line that Margaret Majumdar had proposed, that more consultation was needed in the badly affected areas. This was agreed.

4148 MATTERS ARISING

(a) Minute 4126 – Heathrow Primary School – check if a discussion had been held between LB Hillingdon and the School on future airport development proposals.

1. Ben Morton confirmed that he had spoken with the person who meets with the LB Hillingdon on a weekly basis on Strategic Partnerships.

Both Hillingdon and BAA were aware of the situation. However, until further progress was made in terms of policy or decision to go ahead with planning, it was not thought that there would be any further detailed discussions at this stage. However, the points as minuted had been noted by BAA.

- (b) **Minute 4126 – nominate one HAL and one airline representative to join Working Party re: CAA ‘Improving the Air Passenger Experience’ Survey.**
1. Ben Morton confirmed that Mike Forster who was now the Strategy Director for the whole of BAA was in the process of finalising the structure to decide who he will nominate.
- (c) **Minute 4126 – 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 written report had not yet been produced by the Technical Adviser. It was hoped that this would be available for the next meeting.
- (d) **Minute 4128 – Traffic Stats – Estimated traffic figures for the next year due to the impact of Terminal 5 and the new ‘Open Skies’ era North Atlantic capacity.**
1. The Secretary confirmed that she had not received the estimated traffic figures from Mark Bullock (former BAA Managing Director) who had undertaken to supply these.
- (d) **Minute 4130 – Landing at Heathrow of a Challenger 604 Business Jet experiencing difficulties.**
1. The Technical Adviser confirmed that a letter of protest was sent to the CAA on behalf of the Committee.
- (e) **Minute 4131 – New Residential Night Noise Insulation Scheme for Heathrow.**
1. Ben Morton confirmed that this had been noted by BAA.
- (f) **Minute 4132 – AirTrack Consultation.**
1. The Technical Adviser said that the proposals were still going through. Cllr. Grant representing Spelthorne BC said that they had received no further communication from the promoters of AirTrack following their concerns raised as to third rail or overhead.
- (g) **New Airport Flight Paths Proposal – Consultation - NATS to make a presentation - (NATS made a presentation to Members prior to the 28th May meeting).**
1. This Item was covered under Minute 4145.

(j) Minute 4134 – Traffic Congestion due to Control Posts.

1. The Secretary had contacted Martin Brown, BAA Integration Leader, Logistics & Control Posts, with a view to him setting up a separate meeting with John Gurney, Cllr. Patrick Roberts and Paul Ellis to discuss the issue further.

(k) Minute 4137 – CAA Submission to Competition Commission on the Future of BAA. Please refer to Item 5 of this Agenda.

1. This Item was covered under Minute 4150.

(l) Minute 4138 – House of Commons Transport Committee Report on the Future of BAA.

1. The Technical Adviser said that as some of the Members may know , the Chairman of the House of Commons Transport Committee, Mrs. Gwyneth Dunwoody MP, sadly died several weeks ago. She was a great loss to the transport field as she had done a great deal for it, and had also attended the HACC meetings on several occasions to address the Members. Louise Ellman had been appointed as her successor.

There was a further Hearing on the problems that had arisen on the opening of Terminal 5, where Sir Nigel Rudd, the Chairman of BAA, Mr. Colin Matthews, the Chief Executive of BAA and Mr. Willie Walsh, Chief Executive of British Airways, all gave evidence over a period of a couple of hours.

As far as was known, the Government had not yet published their response to the Transport Committee's Report.

Ben Morton confirmed that a response had been sent, a copy of which would be forwarded to HACC.

ACTION:
BEN
MORTON

(m) Minute 4139 – General Security Awareness Training for PSSC Airside ID pass holders.

1. Ben Morton confirmed that all holders of Airside passes would need to be trained. The deadline for this was the 19th January 2009. BAA had entered into a joint venture with a software company, in order that the training could be completed by computer at home.

(n) Minute 4140 – Heathrow Terminal 5 - Bus Services.

1. Ben Morton confirmed that he had passed this item on re-routing bus (441) on the South side of the airport to the BAA Bus team.

1. John Gurney reported that arising from the meeting of the PSSC on the morning of 28th May 2008, concern had been shown with the 555 and the 557 bus services, one of which terminated at Hatton Cross and the other in the Central Area.

Ideally, where there were three bus routes this had been reduced down to two. It was hoped that one of these would travel to Terminal 5. However, this was up for review by Surrey County Council. It was the likelihood that due to the issues on the Transport for London fare structure, those services would not come into Heathrow, coupled with the fact that it had been revealed that BAA were to withdraw their funding for these services. This would be an extreme shame as they were the only routes that travelled in from the South West to the airport.

4149 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

1. A letter had been received from the London Assembly to inform that at its Annual Meeting on 9th May 2008, Mr Murad Qureshi AM had been nominated to serve on the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee for the period up until the date of the next GLA Elections in 2012.

4150 CAA SUBMISSION TO COMPETITION COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF BAA

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.523 re-addressed**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Technical Adviser said that the Civil Aviation Authority had made this submission to the Competition Commission, which was continuing to work analysing and appointing consultants to advise it further on matters which reflect on the future of BAA. This was an Interim Report entitled 'Emerging Thinking' with a commitment to producing a report with a likely idea of their recommendations by the end of August. By March 2009, the final report would be produced.

4151 ECONOMIC REGULATION OF AIRPORTS

1. Announcement by the Secretary of State for Transport of a further review of the economic regulation of the UK airport system. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.530**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

4152 PUBLICATION OF DEFRA NOISE MAPS FOR URBAN AREAS

1. DEFRA had now published the noise maps for urban areas in accordance with EU legislation. They incorporate previously published noise maps for airports which enables a comparison to be made. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.528**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Virginia Godfrey said that it would be most helpful if hard copies of the noise maps could be provided by Defra.

The Technical Adviser responded that when a request had been made to Defra, they had said that there were no hard copies available for distribution. Copies could only be extracted by going onto their website. However, on accessing the website the text would print, but not the colour maps.

The Technical Adviser said that he would contact Wendy Hartnell at Defra in an effort to secure hard copies of the noise maps for the members of the Committee.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

4153 AIRCRAFT NOISE MONITORING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ANMAC)

1. Minutes of a meeting held in December 2007 of the ANMAC – covering report by the Technical Adviser together with the Minutes (**HACC.531**) had been circulated with the Agenda for the Members only and were noted.
2. The Chairman said that a further meeting of ANMAC had been held in March 2008, the Minutes from which would shortly be available.

ANMAC would look at the question as to whether they could release more information about their deliberations.

3. Rob Gibson said that he was satisfied with the distribution of the Minutes, which had arisen following his request. However, those who had read some of the Night Flights Court Case documentation would see that Mr. Sam White from the Civil Aviation Authority was under the impression that the Members of the Committee had a direct input to that, which was obviously not the case.
Mr. Gibson said that he would be taking this matter up directly with the Department for Transport.

4154 TRANSPORT SECURITY BILL

1. The forthcoming legislative programme announced by the Prime Minister incorporates a Transport Security Bill. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.529**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman informed the Members that this would be the subject of a consultation during the Summer.

4155 VIEWS ON PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF HEATHROW AIRPORT

1. Although the consultation period for the expansion of Heathrow had closed, there is still much activity taking place by the proponents and the opponents of the scheme. This report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.526**) had been circulated with the Agenda to update the Committee on some of these happenings.
2. John Gurney referred to the Press Release advising of the Rally which would be held on 31st May 2008.

He said that he had concern that BAA had allowed this March to travel through the airport with the disruption that this would cause to the passengers.

Ben Morton responded that BAA had held discussions with all the groups involved, e.g. HACAN/Clearskies, 2M, NoTRAG, the Police, British Airways and other airlines. BAA were aware of the issues involved. It was thought that a compromise had been reached on some of the points made, so that it would work for everybody.

BAA had communicated as much as possible to ensure that passengers and staff were not inconvenienced.

4156 INTERIM REPORT BY THE COMPETITION COMMISSION OF ITS MARKET REVIEW OF BAA

1. Report by Technical Adviser (**HACC 532**) was tabled and noted.
2. Paul Ellis said that the new management structure of BAA was welcomed with the increased focus on Heathrow, which it was thought would stand it in good stead going forward.

From the airlines perspective, the amount of attention being given to the current operation long-term was also very much welcomed and the important role of BAA in that.

There was much opportunity, as Terminal 5 was seeing across the board improvements in terms of quality, which had produced a positive and beneficial impact.

When the Chief Operating Officer, Mr. Mike Brown takes up his appointment at BAA in September, the airlines would be very interested in making sure that there was continued focus on issues such as Control Posts, a matter which the passenger did not see, but very much affected the experience, so that vehicles were not queuing to travel from landside to airside. It was important that the programme of improvements to get the logistics of the airport right, continued to go forward.

Terry Morgan responded that this was a very good point. As part of the discussions between BAA, British Airways and other airlines on the implications of the various moves, as part of this, an agreed Control Posts opening schedule had been set out.

3. The Chairman said that **HACC 532** had been discussed by the Members of the PSSC at the meeting on the morning of 28th May 2008.

The Report by the Technical Adviser had stated to the Competition Commission that the Committee was available to supply information if this was required.

The Chairman asked Andy Hull to summarise the discussion which had been held on the subject at the PSSC meeting.

Andy Hull replied that the Members of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee took a Vote as to whether they thought it was a good idea and served a useful purpose to break up BAA, particularly between London Airports.

The result of this was one abstention. Otherwise, there was unanimous agreement that there would be no benefit in doing this.

The Chairman responded that this was due to the comment made earlier that if an airport was at full capacity, there was no point in trying to provide competition artificially.

Andy Hull replied that this was correct. Obviously, passengers made that choice, but the airlines were more constrained at making that choice because of a low budget.

4. Murad Quershi said that he found the result of the Vote taken by the PSSC surprising. He thought that most Londoners would like to see competition e.g. with Luton Airport.
5. Paul Ellis commented that the Competition Commission had actually said that there was scope for competition. They had also addressed the question of capacity. In effect, the ownership of the BAA airports together was one of the reasons for there being a lack of capacity and the rationing of BAA's investment of airports across the South East system. The current arrangement was set up in 1987.
6. Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey said he could not see that capacity should be the only criteria in this debate. Many other factors should be taken into account, such as facilities.
7. Cllr. Potts stated that competition generally tends to bring benefits. Therefore, he found it very difficult to see why the Technical Adviser had stated in his Report that the Committee was opposed to competition.

It was true that capacity was fixed, but could still compete to attract different airlines to airports. Nobody had a choice on the airport. Once passenger had booked their flight, they had to travel to the airport that it was going from. The user decided on either the cheapest or the best airline.

It would seem to any local authority that the airports were arrogant in telling the customer that they would do whatever they wished, irrespective of the comments made by the passenger.

Cllr. Potts said that he felt sure that more competition would lessen this attitude. He was all in favour of competition.

8. The Chairman stated that clearly this was an issue on which the Members would not agree. The Technical Adviser had stated in his report to the Competition Commission that the Committee did undertake work on quality standards and passenger experience and if there was any way in which the Committee could help by providing information, to please make contact.
9. The Technical Adviser commented that there was in effect competition between Luton Airport and the BAA London Airports if an airline wished to take it up. The Regulation in this country had been virtually abandoned in this sense, with the Department for Transport virtually opening up all of the airports to anybody who wished to enter. This was due in part to the Treaty effects which the European Union entered into, by taking the decision out of the hands of the United Kingdom Government, which as some Members may have noted had led to several American Airlines starting up services from Heathrow at the end of March 2008, with aircraft coming in to operate across the Atlantic, which was originally very much dominated by British Airways.

At Luton Airport, all of the airlines could set up if they so wished. However, there was the question as to whether they could make it viable. Therefore, the issue of competition and in particular, the matter to which the Competition Commission referred to, so often ignored that question.

It was not a matter of whether a passenger wished to choose a preferable airport. He had to look to see where an airline had decided that it was in its own interests to provide a service.

There had been a number of attempts around the country, as far up as Manchester and Glasgow to put in long-haul services, particularly from American Airlines. However, they had found that they had lost so much money that they had withdrawn these services.

American Airlines now operated out of Heathrow from which they could make money. They could not make money at some of the other airports and therefore would not go there. There was nobody who had the powers available to make them. It was entirely a commercial decision on the airlines part.

This was one of the reasons why the opportunities for competition between the various airports in London was limited, and it was very much affected by the question of whether capacity was available, and slots could be acquired.

There were other ways of providing competition. There had been opportunities and experiments in Canada at Pearson Airport, where Terminal C was built with private money. However, it was soon found that it did not work this way and had been taken over by the Airport Authority. A similar circumstance had occurred at other airports.

The matter was an extremely complex issue. It was thought that The Competition Commission was not competent to rule on some of the matters.

As illustrated in the Technical Adviser's Report, looking at the composition of the Inquiry Board of the Competition Commission, there did not appear to be anybody with knowledge of the air transport industry.

Therefore, particularly in Appendix B, items from the Competition Commission's report had been highlighted, which it was thought should be drawn to the attention of the Members, which should be affecting the corporate view of the Committee. It was for this reason that the Recommendation had remained unaltered.

It was proposed that a letter would be sent to the Competition Commission to reflect the points made by the Members of the Committee. This was agreed.

ACTION:
TECHNICAL
ADVISER

10. Cllr. Bicknell said that he supported competition. Irrespective of the grievances of this, it was a positive step. He asked if a straw poll could be taken on the view of the Members.

The Chairman asked who would be in favour of the proposal that BAA should be stripped of one of the London Airports.

There was one Member in favour, with the remainder against.

4157 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.

David Gray reported that as explained at the March meeting, whilst the DfT were analysing consultation responses, they would not be able to update the Committee much further at this stage.

Approximately 70,000 responses were received to the consultation. This process would take some time to analyse to make sure that the DfT captured all of the points made in the responses. Once this was completed, advice would be prepared or to consider whether there was further evidence that needed to be reflected upon before the Ministers were in a position to take a decision.

Mr. Gray said that if there were points that he could bring back to the Committee at the next meeting, by way of an update he would do this.

2. Cllr. Bicknell referred to the 70,000 consultation responses received by the DfT. He asked David Gray if he thought that this was a good response, in relation to the amount of advertising undertaken during the consultation period. He asked if there was an estimation available when a conclusion would be reached on the PSDH.

Mr. Gray responded that with regard to the number of responses received, if this was compared to the number of Summary documents that the DfT circulated, some people might think that this was fewer than expected. However, if this was compared with the number of people affected according to the London Boroughs, it might be thought even fewer.

With regards to the timing of the outcome of the consultation, no indication could be made on this.

4158 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 26th March 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were agreed.
2. Andy Hull reported a concern of the Members arising from the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee held on the morning of 28th May 2008. The main purpose of the appointment of the Members to the PSSC was to conduct monitoring of the passenger facilities through the airport three times per year. However, on this occasion, BAA had not completed the responses to the monitoring reports, which tended to make this a fruitless exercise for the Members, both in the devotion of the time spent and the writing up of the reports, when they had not been looked at.

3. The Technical Adviser said that Mr. Morgan had referred to the fact that BAA were in the process of finalising the organisation structure for the future. The representative who used to attend the PSSC meetings to discuss transport matters at Heathrow was no longer able to do so as his team had been disbanded. It was therefore unclear who would cover this subject at future PSSC meetings. It was hoped that by the July meeting, this matter would be resolved and contact would be re-established.

(Secretary's Note): BAA had advised that Mr. Andy Cameron, Retail Operations Product Manager would cover both retail and transport issues at future PSSC meetings.

4. The Technical Adviser informed the Members that he had received a telephone call from the Public Carriage Office (PCO) which licensed the taxis, to advise that the Transport for London Bill was expected finally after several years, to receive the Royal Assent. When that is done, it will require taxi drivers legally to either agree the fare that they would charge the passenger when they went outside of London. Alternatively, if they were unable to agree a fare, they must carry passengers on the meter. This should reduce the problem of extortionate fares charged when people wished to travel outside of Greater London.
5. John Gurney asked if BAA knew whether the closure of the Petrol Station in the Central Area was due to a total shut-down or refurbishment.

Ben Morton replied that he did not know, but would investigate the matter.

ACTION:
BEN
MORTON

4159 NTK WORKING GROUP

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 11th March 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4160 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

4161 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for Quarter 1 (January-March 2008) (*enclosed*).

BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report and Borough Noise Line Figures for Quarter 1 2008 (*to follow*).

4162 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE

1. Report from Heathrow Flight Evaluation Team for the periods of Summer 2007 and Winter 2007 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

2. Margaret Majumdar pointed out that on the Winter 2007 (28th October 2007 - 29th March 2008) Report that the actual number of flights seemed to be 20% above the level permitted, taking account of the discounted flights. It was thought that 20% was quite an imposition on residents, on top of the movements already experienced.
3. Cllr. Phillip Bicknell had observed that there seemed to be one particular flight number who was a very frequent offender (Cathay Pacific 938). He asked if an explanation could be given on this and why it had not been dealt with previously.

The Technical Adviser explained that sometimes flights were early or late. There could be problems en-route, particularly if it was a Cathay Pacific flight arriving from Hong Kong. It could be an 8-12 hour flight which could run into bad weather. The delays seemed to be far fewer than they used to be.

Cllr. Bicknell continued that the residents of Windsor & Maidenhead had just encountered 27 days of the same landing pattern because of the winds. The one Cathay Pacific flight seemed to be taking all of the complaints. The residents living under the flight path could not understand this.

(Secretary's Note): Reference was made to a Cathay Pacific flight number. It had since been established that this was not Cathay Pacific, but China Airways.

Nita Easey responded that the flights listed were monitored by both BAA and the DfT. They were not included in the Night Quota period, they were outside of that. As these were the noisiest flights, both BAA and the DfT were required to look at these, to make sure that there was not an issue that they needed to speak to the airline about.

With regard to Margaret Majumdar's point, it would not just be the dispensations, there would also be the exempt aircraft.

Nita Easey explained that there were two periods during which there were restrictions at night. The first was the Night Period (11.00 hrs. – 07.00 hrs.). Within that, was the Night Quota Period (11.30 hrs. – 06.00 hrs). During this period, there was two limits. one was on the number of Movements and the other was on the Quota limits.

Margaret Majumdar had observed that within that Night Quota period there were more flights than the DfT had claimed the limits were. It was correct that some of that was because there was an allowance under very strict circumstances, whereby outside of the limits there may be other flights. These are disregarded. This is where there was widespread Air Traffic Control delays, which meant that the whole of Europe would be impacted. When that happened, it was not possible to stop the aircraft mid-flight. There were a number of other strict criteria.

It was agreed that there were more flights in the Season than are allowed under the limits, but they were strictly controlled and only allowed to fly under the Rules that the DfT had placed upon BAA.

Margaret Majumdar responded that the flights kept the residents awake. During the last month, there had been constant noise over the Ealing area, officially from 06.00 hrs. – 23.30 hrs. This equalled 17.5 hours. When a flight was allowed to take off late, it kept people awake even longer, which meant that they were only getting 5.5 hours sleep. This was not sufficient. Obviously, if the flight was already in the air, it had to land. However, it could not be understood why they were allowed to take off into the Night period.

Nita Easey responded that there were Rules that an aeroplane was not allowed to land in the Night period and then take-off again. Aircraft in the air had to land. Also, aircraft could not be parked on the ground either. There were restrictions. Aircraft had to be kept moving.

The situation was managed. Dispensation was only allowed when it met the criteria as laid down by the DfT.

4. The Chairman requested that when the next Night Quota Report was due for circulation to the Members that a list of salient explanatory points is also included. This was agreed and that Nita Easey makes a presentation to the Members.

ACTION:
NITA
EASEY

5. Paul Ellis asked David Gray for an up-date on the Judicial Review.

David Gray responded that as Members would be aware, the Night Noise regime that was put in place in 2006 was subject to a Judicial Challenge. The Court Hearing had been held the previous week. The Court found in the Department for Transport's favour on all counts.

That regime was now secure until it was due for renewal in 2012. Obviously, that would be preceded by a full consultation ahead of it.

6. Cllr. Bicknell responded that in relation to David Grays's reply, he did not think that this was good. As one who lived under the flightpath, the 747 400 series was not in the correct category, as it awoke him at 04.15 hrs. each morning.
7. Cllr. Maddan said that it was because of a major loophole in the processes that the Judicial Review Court Hearing found in favour of the DfT.

David Gray responded to these comments. There was due process for such matters. It was a fact that it was the subject of a Court Hearing. He said that he had thought that he had stated factually that the Court had found that the right decision had been made in the favour of the Department for Transport.

4163 NEWS RELEASES

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

4164 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY 16th JULY 2008