

## HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the Business Meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2008 at Heathrow Point West

#### PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Ian Potts	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. James Randall (Deputy)	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. Mo Khursheed	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. John Oswell (Deputy)	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Josephine Barrett	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Felicity Barwood	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Phillip Bicknell	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy)	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Christopher Turrell	-	Bracknell Forest BC
Cllr. David Rowlands	-	Bucks County Council
Cllr. Trevor Egleton (Deputy)	-	Bucks County Council
Cllr. Moreton Moore (Deputy)	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Balvinder Bains	-	Slough BC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Gerald Forsbrey (Deputy)	-	Spelthorne BC
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN Clearskies
Lynette Braithwaite	-	AUC
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
John Gurney	-	TUC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Susan Laurie	-	Independent
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent

#### HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Simon Baugh	-	Director of Airport Communications
-------------	---	------------------------------------

#### PRESENTERS

Mike Noakes	-	BAA General Manager, Rail Projects
-------------	---	------------------------------------

## **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

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

1. Cllr. Ruth Cadbury (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey ( LB Hounslow), Cllr. Jim Maddan (Wandsworth BC)), Cllr. Martin Elengorn (LB Richmond on Thames), Cllr. Alan Oxley (South Bucks DC), Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos (Surrey County Council), Cllr. Denise Grant (Spelthorne BC), Cllr. Patrick Roberts (Runnymede BC ), David Gray (DfT), Frank Wingate (Future Heathrow), Philip Carlisle (GTMC), Susan Parsons (ABTA), Paul Ellis (IATA), Colin Mitchell (Independent).

### **4203 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Minutes of the meeting held on 24th September 2008 were agreed.

### **4204 MATTERS ARISING**

#### **3. MATTERS ARISING**

##### **(a) Minute 4186 – Noise Fines Fund – Review allocation of monies.**

1. Simon Baugh reported that BAA had recently issued cheques to the value of £155K from the Noise Fines Fund following applications from local authorities; LB Richmond (£90K), LB Hillingdon (£30K) and LB Ealing (£35K).

To allocate the remaining funds and other monies collected, BAA would be launching a large Grant Scheme in the New Year to run alongside the Community Environment Awards. The new scheme would be used for the local communities, in the surrounding Boroughs, particularly those affected by aircraft noise.

It would be made clear in the communication that the money was collected from the airlines and was not a BAA funded scheme. It was not to mitigate, but compensate for noise, to those living closest to Heathrow. It would be most widely open to educational establishments, local community organisations and charities within the eight local authorities (Hillingdon, Hounslow, Richmond, Ealing, Slough, Windsor & Maidenhead, Spelthorne and Runnymede). They could bid for sums between £10K-£50K but would need to demonstrate benefits to the local community.

It was hoped that the awards would be given out twice per year.

This would probably be administered in the same way as other schemes, by Groundwork Thames Valley, which is an environmental charity, and the decisions of who should receive the awards would be taken by a Judging Panel made up of BAA staff and other representatives. The NTK Working Group and British Airways had already been approached to participate.

##### **(b) Minute 4186 – Respond to Rob Gibson – Application for Community Noise Insulation Bid.**

1. Rob Gibson confirmed that he had received a response from BAA to the Bid submitted by LB Hounslow.

**(c) Minute 4186 – Respond to John Gurney – Rolling Transport work for AirTrack.**

1. John Gurney confirmed that he had received a response from BAA to his query.

**(d) Minute 4186 – Respond to John Gurney – 555 Bus series.**

1. John Gurney confirmed that he had received a response from BAA to his query.

**(e) Minute 4186 – Respond to Maurice Hudson – provide speaker for RaeS Air Transport debate on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2008.**

1. This event had taken place with Mike Forster as the speaker representing BAA.

**(f) Minute 4186 – Provide update on Stage 2 of AirTrack Consultation**

1. Please refer to Minute 4206.

**(g) Minute 4189 – Submit letter to NATS on Report of First Analysis of Responses – TCN consultation.**

1. The Technical Adviser confirmed that a response letter had been submitted on behalf of the Committee.

**(h) Minute 4189 – Submit response to the issuing party of the Draft Code of Practice on Customs Examination of Baggage in the Absence of the Passenger.**

1. The Chairman confirmed that a response letter had been submitted on behalf of the Committee.

**(j) Minute 4192 – Establish from LB Hillingdon contact for Control on Imports of Animal Products.**

1. Cllr. Josephine Barrett had agreed to take this action forward, but was not present at this stage of the meeting to report on her findings.

**(k) Minute 4196 – Numbered identification badges for Security Staff.**

1. The Chairman advised that this matter was ongoing. The matter was being looked at very seriously by BAA and several alternative ways of handling this were being considered.

**(l) Minute 4198 – Community Noise Insulation Board Minutes**

1. Please refer to Minute 4209.

**(m) Minute 4200 – Planning Application – establish exact location of proposed Concrete Batching Plant.**

1. Simon Baugh advised that John Gurney had raised this issue. The location of the grassed area 17A was on the Southern Perimeter Road between Control Posts 24 and 25.

**4205 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT**

1. Due to a clash of dates between the 27<sup>th</sup> May 2009 HACC meeting and the Annual Meeting of Airport Consultative Committees, it was proposed that the HACC meeting is now held on Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2009.

However, the Chairman agreed that the proposed revised date of 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2009 was unsuitable as it fell prior to the May Spring Bank Holiday weekend.

**(Secretary's Note):** An alternative date had now been agreed. The May HACC meeting will be deferred until **Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2009.**

**4206 CONSULTATION FOR AIRTRACK**

1. Presentation by Mike Noakes, General Manager, Rail Projects (*enclosed*).  
Earlier this year, BAA had announced it would launch a community consultation on Heathrow AirTrack, once preliminary technical and environmental assessments had been completed. The proposal would see construction of a new rail link between Heathrow and Staines, with rail services to the rest of the network via Waterloo, Guildford and Reading. There were two main stages of consultation prior to submitting a Transport and Works Act application. The first stage in early 2008 considered possible options for the scheme. The second stage of consultation open from 20<sup>th</sup> October 2008 until 15<sup>th</sup> December 2008 would seek views on the final preferred option for Heathrow AirTrack.

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

2. The Chairman asked if the forthcoming problems that Spelthorne BC had reported, which the proposed AirTrack scheme would bring to their area had been resolved.

Mike Noakes responded that it was not correct to say that all the problems had been resolved.

3. Cllr. Forsbrey representing Spelthorne BC, agreed that it was not correct to say that they had solved many of their problems with BAA. They were most concerned about the down-times and the backing-up of traffic into Staines. It was not thought that people realised the amount of time that the level crossings would be down. One level crossing would be down 38 minutes in every hour, and those in Richmond would be down for 12 minutes in every hour in addition to the current down-time This down-time for level crossings would back up all the way into Waterloo.

Cllr. Forsbrey said that his local authority was taking all the pain but not getting anything out of it at present. They had worked very hard with BAA, but had been drip-fed information on different aspects of the AirTrack proposal and were unhappy at the situation.

Spelthorne BC had now agreed at their Executive meeting the response to BAA, which would be put forward imminently. The proposed down-times of the level crossings would be catastrophic for Staines due to the back-up of traffic.

If the trains travelled into Staines from Reading, Guildford and Woking, the Chord would need to be taken forward around Staines. Spelthorne BC had many plans for the area of Staines, but could not pursue these at present due to the uncertainty of the situation and whether BAA and AirTrack intended to continue with their proposal around the Chord.

4. Cllr. Bains asked why Slough BC had been ignored yet again in the AirTrack scheme. Windsor, Maidenhead and Reading were being linked. Slough was a multi-cultural town with 122,000 people, many of whom worked at the airport. It had one of the busiest trading centres in Europe, but nothing was being done to assist the town.

Mike Noakes responded that the AirTrack scheme did not preclude or rule out a connection from the North and West. However, there was a big catchment area which needed to be prioritised.

5. John Gurney referred to the length of the down-times of the level crossings. One of the issues was the EWS and the freight trains which travelled through. As they were so slow-moving combined with their length, the level crossings were down for a considerable period of time. This was certainly one of the areas which had caused a big issue.

Mike Noakes responded that clearly, from the public exhibitions the timing of the closure of the level crossings had caused concern for people. There were some level crossings which would be down for less with AirTrack, although this was not applicable to the Spelthorne/Staines area. This was due to the fact that this was the way the timetable worked. There would be two trains crossing at the same time, whereas previously there were three.

6. The Chairman asked if it was known where the funding for AirTrack would be provided from.

Mike Noakes responded that some of the funding had been included in the BAA Capital Investment Plan for the next five years. Discussions were also being held with the Department for Transport on this together with the fact that there was a demand for extra seats into Waterloo. A solution had yet to be established.

7. Roger Wiltshire said that he gave the AirTrack scheme his support for Heathrow, for what was, a relatively low cost rail project. With regard to the aspect on the level crossings, realistic solutions were trying to be found.

8. Cllr. Bicknell said that with regard to the point made by Cllr. Bains, he agreed that to travel from Slough to Paddington was a 'delight', but to travel from Windsor to Waterloo was a much longer journey. Therefore, it would be good if Slough Station could be joined up with Heathrow on AirTrack.

With regard to the aspect on the level crossings, it was this point that would cause many problems. However, if the situation came down to money, were tunnels and bridges being considered. This had not been mentioned.

Mike Noakes responded that it was not about money, or tunnels and bridges, because in a number of those locations it was possible to bridge over the railway, or tunnel over the railway and immediately get clogged at the very next Junction which was less than 100 metres away. Clearly again, it would then be necessary to convince a Planning Inspector that it was necessary to obtain Compulsory Purchase power to take some land to solve a problem, which would actually not be solved. It was for this reason that an integrated solution was needed and for the Highways people to work with BAA.

9. Cllr. Morton Moore commented that unfortunately, the consultation demand did not include the Runnymede area for the rail lines that ran through it to Egham and Chertsey. There was a problem with the infrastructure at the moment, but adding AirTrack would make a bad situation much worse. Unfortunately, there were only 60 minutes in one hour. If the level crossing gates were closed for 44 minutes per hour, this would only leave 16 minutes per hour when they were open.

Unless some other provision could be made to cross these railway lines either by bridge, tunnel or even by more efficient signalling, so that the down-times were less, the local authority, residents, traders and emergency services could not support AirTrack, as good a scheme as it is.

10. Andy Hull said that there so many conflicts of interest on the level crossings, apart from all of the safety issues involved, there must be a strong case for tunnelling the railway under some of these. It would then be possible to put another two lines under ground between Barnes and Richmond. This would increase the capacity on the railway and leave some of the existing services and level crossings alone. Ideally, it would be desirable to put the whole scheme underground. It was thought that rail tunnels would be the answer more so than road tunnel.

11. The Chairman asked for the general consensus of the Committee on the support of the AirTrack scheme.

There was a good majority of the Committee in support of the Airtrack Scheme with six Members against.

12. The Technical Adviser said that at the January 2008 meeting of the Committee, when Mr. Noakes last attended to present on AirTrack, there was considerable concerns shown amongst the Members that represented the area around Spelthorne about the prospect of third rail or overhead electricity.

In the current consultation, it did state 'that overhead line electrification would not extend onto Staines Moor or into Staines Town Centre'.

The Technical Adviser asked if those Members who originally raised this question were satisfied with this Statement and that the concerns were no longer valid.

Cllr. Forsbrey said that this was correct. BAA had listened to the concerns of Spelthorne BC and were now going to go from overhead to third rail, as the train came out of the tunnel near to Terminal 5, for which the local authority was very grateful.

This was one of many issues that BAA had resolved, but there were many others that still had not been resolved.

The Chairman thanked Mike Noakes for the constructive presentation.

#### **4207 (HOME OFFICE) CONSULTATION BEGINS TO BRING NATIONAL IDENTITY SCHEME A STEP CLOSER TO REALITY**

1. Press Release regarding the introduction of the first Identity Cards for British Citizens, including Airside workers at London City and Manchester Airports from Autumn 2009, ahead of a nationwide roll-out had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman advised that at the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee on the morning of 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2008, the members agreed to object to the fact that Airside workers needed Identity Cards. This requirement was at a very early stage and would be trialled at Manchester and London City Airports.
3. The Technical Adviser stated that the issue was an important one. There was a consultation out on the debate which would close on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2009, regarding the secondary legislation, to bring into force this requirement for people to have identity cards. It would be trialled over a period of eighteen months at Manchester and London City Airports. On the basis of those findings, they will be continuing, so that all Airside workers at airports, who had been singled out, would need to obtain an Identity Card before they could receive a Criminal Record Check (CRC).

As many of the Members would be aware, this was essential in achieving the issuing of an Airside ID Pass to be able to undertake the work of the PSSC and HACC. It would almost certainly involve the Members of the Committee who needed Security passes or possibly even include the process for the visits that were made periodically.

In order to obtain an Identity Card a fee of £30.00 was payable. The question then arose as to who would pay for this. It was imagined that Members of the Committee would look to BAA to do so, because it would be necessary to obtain a Card to undertake their duties in connection with the work of the Committee. However, that aspect was not yet clear and had to be determined.

The PSSC members had agreed, that as a matter of policy, they were against their being treated just the same as Airside workers. In principle, and because they already had Airside ID Passes, they should not be required to need Identity Cards. This was regardless of whether the members supported the introduction of Identity Cards for people generally or whether it was just for Airside workers.

The Technical Adviser asked the Members to indicate whether or not they supported the need to obtain an Identity Card for Airside workers, which would include Members of the Committee.

4. Roger Wiltshire said that this issue had been debated for the past several months when the Home Secretary announced the proposal without any forewarning. Technically, the industry would be treated as 'guinea pigs' for the introduction of the National Identity Card Scheme.

For those Members not directly involved in the industry, the argument from the Government was not about security; it was about additional 'better' processes for the role of identity of individuals before they took their jobs. BATA believed that staff Airside already had very vigorous vetting checks made on their national identity, in addition to the Security and the Criminal Record Check, which would still be maintained.

BATA thought that the introduction of the National Identity Card Scheme would be an added process, rather than an improved process. No airline was known to support this approach and did not like being treated as 'guinea pigs' in an area where they were already being extremely well vetted. However, it was unfortunate that the Government were intent on introducing this scheme starting with Manchester and London City Airports, the outcome of which would need to be looked at and the position reported upon.

5. Iain Hope commented that in the past, there had been considerable delays in being able to recruit extra Security staff at times of crisis, with the length of time that it took to clear the Security vetting process. With the new proposal, it would indicate that this would result in a further layer of delay added. He said that he on behalf of the users were unhappy about the situation, as Security needed to be improved, but not delivered many months after.
6. John Gurney advised that many meetings had taken place between various parties on this subject, both from the business side and the Trade Unions. They were all very clear, and unusually in agreement, that the response was 'No' to the introduction of National Identity Cards for Airside workers. It did not bring any added value to the security at airports. Airport workers were being used as an 'easy target'.
7. Cllr. Potts agreed that the introduction of this would cause another problem and add to the clearance delays for Airside ID passes.
8. The Chairman reminded the Committee Members, particularly those on the PSSC, to keep their BAA Airside Passes valid by ensuring that they visited the airport and swiped them within the 60 day period since the last use. Otherwise the pass would be 'parked' and would need reactivating again by the BSC in Glasgow.
9. From the discussion, the Technical Adviser understood that the Members of the Committee supported some resolution to this consultation that they were against Airside workers and themselves in particular, needing to obtain National Identity Cards.

This was agreed.

**4208 DfT's AIRCRAFT NOISE MONITORING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ANMAC)**

1. Summary Note of the ANMAC meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman said that he had raised at the last ANMAC meeting the request from Rob Gibson that the Minutes of those meetings could be put forward in the public domain.

The DfT had decided to publish a Summary Note following each ANMAC meeting, which the Chairman felt was of more help than the Minutes.

3. Rob Gibson thanked the Chairman for his efforts. However, he would still like to see a copy of the Minutes of the ANMAC meetings and would probably exercise his right under the Freedom of Information provision to obtain these.

**4209 HEATHROW AIRPORT COMMUNITY INSULATION BOARD LIMITED**

1. Minutes of the meetings of the Community Insulation Board held on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2008, 19<sup>th</sup> March 2008, 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2008 and 17<sup>th</sup> September 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

**4210 NTK WORKING GROUP**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

**4211 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Cllr. Bicknell referred to Minute 6.7 and 6.9 paragraph 10 relating to Taxis at Heathrow. He referred to the proposal put forward several years ago for an area in Stanwell, which was apparently owned by BAA to be allocated for non-Metropolitan taxis. He asked if any progress had been made on this.

The Chairman responded that it was agreed that there was a proposal put forward several years ago in this respect, but he was unaware of any progress on this matter.

3. The Technical Adviser said that the legislation had been passed in this respect. It was now up to the Public Carriage Office (PCO) to ensure that it is in fact observed by the taxi drivers.

Discussions had been held between the PSSC and the Public Carriage Office over a period of several years in an effort to make progress on the matter. The PCO did undertake a monitoring exercise, but in the past, did not look at the question of taxis going across the Border between Greater London and the Counties outside. However, the legislation which was passed and given the Royal Approval in July of this year, did provide that taxi drivers either had to positively agree with a passenger the journey fare before they commenced the journey or they must undertake the journey on the meter, even if this meant going outside of Greater London.

Currently, it was not clear what had happened as a result of this legislation. The Committee had pressed the Public Carriage Office to undertake reviews or surveys of this, but were still awaiting the results.

With regard to the suggestion of a stand outside of the airport, this was not being pursued, as it was not considered to be practicable. It would mean that a passenger would need to access a taxi stand from possibly the London Underground or Terminal. If a passenger knew their way around the local area and wished to obtain a taxi more easily and cheaply to travel outside of the airport, they could go to the taxi stand outside of Hatton Cross Station. This could prove beneficial, as the taxi drivers at that location tended to take passengers across the Border far more cheaply than if a taxi had been taken from the Central Terminal Area.

4. Cllr. Bicknell continued that the taxi debate was an ongoing issue. The fact was that this problem was a restrictive practice and there should be a means for local taxis from the various Boroughs to take part in the business that occurred at Heathrow Airport.

The Technical Adviser responded that it was not one of the usual restrictive practices when people referred to this matter. It was the law.

#### **4212 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT**

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report and Borough Noise Line Figures for Quarter 3 (July-September 2008) (*to follow*) and LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for Quarter 3 (July - September 2008) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

#### **4213 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE**

1. Report from BAA Heathrow Flight Evaluation Team for the period Summer 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Margaret Majumdar stated that she remained concerned at the number of departures allowed in the Night Period, especially in some weeks, where the highest amount was 56 flights had been recorded which equated to 8 per night.

This was disturbing and it was of surprise to learn that so many had been permitted. One of the heaviest routes was week commencing 12<sup>th</sup> July 2008, out of the 56 Night-time departures, 44 were not counted because they were delayed. It was not known if this was due to weather-related problems. However, this seemed unacceptable for the people living underneath the flight paths, that there were so many take-offs in the Night-period after 11.30 p.m. It was a massive disturbance to the residents to be deprived of sleep and to their ability to work effectively the following day.

The Chairman responded with a suggestion that Mrs. Majumdar should raise this matter with the Chief Operating Officer, Mr. Mike Brown who would be in attendance at the HACC Seminar in the afternoon, following on from the main Business meeting.

3. Cllr. Bicknell said that apart from adults losing sleep and being unable to effectively work the following day, consideration should be given to the children who were also losing their sleep in the hours of the early morning and needed to attend school to receive an education. They were after all, the future generation who would be paying the pensions of the Committee Members.
4. The Technical Adviser reminded the Committee Members that representations were made to the Aviation Minister, Jim Fitzpatrick MP several months ago about the fact that Margaret Majumdar had raised regarding the number of 'excuse' flights. It had been suggested to the Minister that all flights which took place during the restricted hours regardless of the reason, should be counted against the Quota. However, this did not find favour and the request was turned down by the Aviation Minister. It was therefore not for the lack of action on behalf of the Committee, but the fact that the suggestion was not acceptable to the Department for Transport.

#### **4214 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

#### **4215 ENVIRONMENT & LOCAL ISSUES SUB-COMMITTEE**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Environment & Local Issues Sub-Committee meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> November 2008 had been tabled and were noted, together with copies of the presentations made.
2. Margaret Majumdar thanked the Chairman for the useful documentation. However, she was unable to see included in the documentation a copy of the response made on behalf of the Committee, the deadline of which was 27<sup>th</sup> November 2008.

The Technical Adviser confirmed that this had been sent and a copy would be provided to the Members in due course.

**ACTION:**  
**TECHNICAL ADVISER**

3. Virginia Godfrey referred to Minute 2.14 and requested that the wording to the second paragraph should be amended to read as follows:-

‘She thought that it should not be up to BAA to make this decision, but for the people affected to decide. The Consultant advising DEFRA, Mr. Stephen Turner, had said that BAA must be ‘true to themselves’ and make decisions for the airport’.

#### **4216 DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT - EMERGING THINKING OF THE INDEPENDENT PANEL ON AIRPORT REGULATION**

1. The document summarised the thoughts of the Expert Panel; as of early November 2008. The Panel appointed earlier in 2008 to advise the review of Airport Regulation, has held several meetings. Its members have presided over workshops with stakeholders in London and Edinburgh. The document which summarised the Panel's 'emerging thinking' had been tabled and was noted.
2. The Chairman advised that one of the members of the Panel was Mr. David Gray who had normally attended the HACC meetings.

3. The Chairman referred to the final paragraph of the Paper which stated that:

*'a further licence condition could require (some) airports to have consultation procedures with local authorities and the community in relation to noise and other local impacts, such as land use and congestion'.*

It was not understood why the Panel on Regulation should be going down the consultation route. However, if they are, the Committee needed to draw to their attention the existing consultation procedures which existed before they went too far down that road, unless any of the Members objected to this.

4. Margaret Majumdar asked if the response from the Committee could include the fact that the Northolt Aerodrome Committee had not met for several years, upon which a representative from Ealing Council sat.

The Technical Adviser responded that Northolt was regarded as a Military Aerodrome and therefore the proposals did not apply to it.

5. The Chairman agreed that a letter could be sent to the Chairman of the Panel to bring these matters to his attention.
6. The Technical Adviser added that the Report of the Panel had stated that their concerns looked at the environmental duty given to the Civil Aviation Authority. They believed that this duty could best be achieved by imposing licence conditions on Price Control and the intermediate tier of airports. Heathrow was a Price Controlled Airport. Therefore, the proposals that were suggested clearly would not apply to Heathrow Airport, if they were pursued.

As the Chairman had stated it would do no harm to write to the Chairman of the Panel. None of the members of that Panel were recognised as being actively involved in the operation of airports. There were a couple in the education field, but it was not thought that they were closely in touch with aviation matters.

To protect the interests of the Committee, it was suggested that a letter should be written to point out that some of the procedures that they were suggesting should be brought into being already existed, and that of the 54 airports around the country, had Consultative Committees already which dealt with the matters suggested for future consultation or investigation.

**ACTION:**  
**TECHNICAL ADVISER**

7. Rob Gibson referred to the inaccurate comment made by the Technical Adviser on the make up of the Panel members and pointed out that Dr. Andrew Sentance was British Airways' Chief Economist and Environment Director and therefore involved in aviation.

The Technical Adviser responded that he was well aware of the position that Dr. Andrew Sentance held at British Airways prior to taking up his position on the Monetary Policy Committee at the Bank of England. However, reference was being made to airports and not airlines.

**4217 BAA STATEMENT ON CHERRY LANE CEMETERY**

1. The BAA Statement released reconfirming its commitment that a road would not be constructed within the Cherry Lane Cemetery boundary had been tabled and was noted.
2. Cllr. Khursheed stated that people no longer trusted BAA with such statements issued, due to their past experience of them. When Terminal 5 was built after a long Public Inquiry, BAA had said that there would be no need for a third runway or Terminal 6. However, then the debate about Cherry Lane Cemetery arose when BAA wanted to put a road through it. After much protestation from the residents, as their loved ones were buried there, BAA had suddenly done a 'U' turn. However, it was thought that they were not to be believed.

**4218 NEWS RELEASES**

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

**4219 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

**WEDNESDAY 28<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2009**

**DATES OF 2009 MEETINGS:**

**WEDNESDAY 28<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2009**

**WEDNESDAY 25<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2009**

**THURSDAY 11<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2009**

**WEDNESDAY 29<sup>th</sup> JULY 2009**

**WEDNESDAY 23<sup>rd</sup> SEPTEMBER 2009**

**WEDNESDAY 2<sup>nd</sup> DECEMBER 2009 (SEMINAR)**

.



