

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 23rd September 2009 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. Ian Potts	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Santokh Dhillon	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Felicity Barwood	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Ruth Cadbury	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Geoff Acton	-	LB Richmond upon Thames
Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy)	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Christopher Turrell	-	Bracknell Forest BC
Cllr. Peter Cartwright	-	Bucks CC
Cllr. Patrick Roberts	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. Balvinder Bains	-	Slough BC
Cllr. Alan Oxley	-	South Bucks DC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Gerald Forsbrey (Deputy)	-	Spelthorne BC
Murad Qureshi	-	London Assembly
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Lynette Braithwaite	-	AUC
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Isobel Knox (Deputy)	-	IATA
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
John Gurney	-	TUC
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Susan Laurie	-	Independent
Richard Taylor	-	Independent

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Mike Forster	-	R3 Director
Simon Baugh	-	Director of Airport Communications

PRESENTERS

Phil Wilbrahim	-	BAA Heathrow Eastern Campus Director
Duncan Pickard	-	BAA Senior Project Leader
Richard Robinson	-	HEX Managing Director
Steve Chambers	-	HEX Service Proposition Director
Phil Roberts	-	CAA – Asst. Director of Airspace Policy

OTHERS

Frank Evans

- Department for Transport

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

Mike Brown (BAA), Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey (LB Hounslow), Cllr. John Oswell (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Jim Maddan (LB Wandsworth), Cllr. Ian Lake & Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos (Surrey CC), Philip Carlisle (GTMC), Susan Parsons (ABTA), Frank Wingate (Future Heathrow), Colin Mitchell (Independent), Ian Ramsay (Independent).

4290 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 29th July 2009 were agreed with the following amendment:-
 2. **(Secretary's Note):** Murad Qureshi had requested that point 5 of Minute 4277 should read 'in November 2009, the London Assembly Environment Committee would be looking at the Environmental Regulatory Controls of Future Expansion at Heathrow'.
- a) **Minute 4275 - Update Committee Members on the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) process at a future meeting (Mike Forster).**
 1. It was agreed that an update would be provided at the HACC Seminar on 2nd December 2009. Two consultation papers had been published on the Applications to the Infrastructure Planning Commission and consultation on the Pre-Application Consultation.
- b) **Minute 4277 - Establish why aviation fuel still arriving by freight train into North London depot re: Buncefield oil disaster in 2005. Provide figures for freight totals (Simon Baugh).**
 1. The Buncefield fire had destroyed part of the pipeline network for Total UK responsible for serving Heathrow Airport with aviation fuel. It was therefore necessary to deliver by road and rail. With regard to the figures for freight totals at Heathrow, this had been included as part of the management's Heathrow Report.
- c) **Minute 4278 - Provide a PM10 Analysis to Murad Qureshi (London Assembly)/HACC Secretary before September HACC meeting (David Vowles).**
 1. This had been actioned.
- d) **Minute 4278 - Provide HACC Secretary with a copy of the BAA Heathrow Local Air Quality Action Plan 2007-2011 (David Vowles) - Received.**
 1. This had been actioned.

(e) **Minute 4280 - Members to provide comments to the Secretariat on Draft Noise Action Plan to include in the HACC response.**

1. This was covered under Minute 4304.

(f) **Minute 4281 - Establish in which BAA document commitment for taxiway improvements was referred to (Simon Baugh).**

1. This was included as part of the Capital Investment Programme.

(f) **Minute 4281 - Arrange for Richard Robinson, new Managing Director of Heathrow Express//Heathrow Connect service to present to the Committee for introduction and to discuss structure of fares (Simon Baugh).**

1. This was covered under Minute 4294.

4291 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

- (a) As the Chairman had reported at the July meeting, the term of office for the current Independent Members of the HACC and Passenger Services Sub-Committee had been extended by the consent of BAA for a further three years.

BAA had advertised for volunteers to fill the remaining two vacancies. Interviews had been conducted. It had been decided that there would be two new Members joining the Committee. Mr. Richard Taylor, who had flown through Heathrow Airport on hundreds of occasions during the last ten years and was involved in various airport infrastructure schemes in different parts of the World. Mr. Ian Ramsay who was an expert on air traffic management would commence in December 2009.

The Chairman welcomed Richard Taylor to his first meeting of the Committee.

- (b) The BAA offices had moved from Heathrow Point West to the Compass Centre and the HACC office had re-located into the Heathrow Academy, where all future meetings would take place. The car parking arrangements would remain as currently for the Members.

4292 HEATHROW MANAGEMENT MATTERS

1. (a) Dialogue with Mr. Mike Forster and Simon Baugh of Heathrow Airport.
(b) BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been tabled and was noted.

2. The Chairman advised the Members that Mr. Mike Brown, Chief Operating Officer of Heathrow Airport had sent Apologies for his absence at the meeting.

Mr. Brown had recently been appointed Managing Director of London Underground, but would remain at BAA until March 2010 and attend HACC meetings until that date.

Mr. Forster presented the Heathrow Update report with Simon Baugh (*enclosed*).

3. A copy of the 100-page book, 'A Week at the Airport, a Heathrow Diary' written by Heathrow's first writer-in-residence, the philosopher and novelist Alain de Botton was made available for each Member of the Committee.

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

4. Margaret Majumdar said that she was puzzled at the change of name terminology from Heathrow East to Terminal 2. This suggested that there will be a Terminal 1.

Mike Forster replied that this matter was still the subject of some debate. Certainly, for the first period of time, Terminal 2 would need to operate as currently. When the second phase of Terminal 2 opened, it would be necessary to shut Terminal 1.

Margaret Majumdar thought it would be better to re-name part of the development Terminal 1, as passengers would be permanently puzzled, by there not appearing to be a Terminal 1.

Certainly, the name proposal already in place seemed to be the better of a number of options.

5. Margaret Majumdar referred to the BAA Draft Noise Action Plan and stated that she was not the only person who had experienced great difficulty in down-loading the on-line questionnaire from the website. For the few weeks remaining of the consultation period, would it be possible for BAA to re-send this as a Word attachment.

Mike Forster replied that there was no point in having a consultation questionnaire if people were unable to access this. He agreed to investigate the possibility of re-sending the questionnaire in Word format.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

6. Iain Hope asked firstly, if it was correctly understood that at the end of November 2009, the current round of airline moves would be complete. Secondly, reference was made to the Terminal 3 movement of the Australian airlines. He asked if this meant that basically British Airways were now all housed in Terminal 5, except the Australian airlines.

This question was asked in order to explain to potential passengers what they should be asking the travel agents.

Mike Forster responded that the answer to both aspects of the question was 'no'.

Firstly, in relation to completion of the moves; by Christmas 2009, Step 8 would be completed. There was a further Step 9, which would take more traffic out of Terminal 3 by moving it to Terminal 4.

This would be done because during the Summer, Terminal 3 had been highly stressed. The difficulty was always going to be that by putting more capacity into the airport, by moving around and also shutting Terminal 2, passengers would obviously have to face further changes. Therefore, it was necessary to address that.

The schedules of the carriers which were moving into Terminal 4, now that they had been analysed in detail, were proving difficult to get to work with on the current baggage system. It therefore might prove necessary to conduct further work on the T4 baggage system to accommodate the profile of the passengers. In the evening peak, they were very heavy baggage users. This unfortunately meant, that Terminal 3 would not get relieved as much as BAA would like it to be until after some time.

Secondly, there were also two short-haul fleets in Terminal 2 and Terminal 3. The Spanish fleet which was linked to Iberia and Alitalia.

7. Cllr. Bains understood that when Terminal 5 was built, it was completed for British Airways only. It was still occasionally confusing for passengers as they were sent to Terminal 5 and had to then go back to Terminal 4. The travel agents were not advertising the correct Terminal that the airlines were travelling from.

The airport was very hectic on a Sunday evening and it was not possible to get through to Terminal 1, 2 and 3 at all due to the traffic congestion.

Cllr. Bains asked why all the airlines were not being moved, or was it a case of British Airways 'keeping a foot in the door' by using both Terminal 3 and Terminal 5.

Mike Forster responded that the communication to passengers of where the airlines were based had been of great concern to BAA. Information on this had been put on the website, with advertising on the Heathrow Express and people walking around wearing jumpers with the information printed on to advise people.

Prior to the airlines moving, many passengers were used to arriving at a specific Terminal at a particular time for their flights.

The issue of communicating the large number of airline moves had been ongoing.

In terms of the Terminal 5 issue, it was important not to confuse the two issues that were underway. The moves were still making their way through. It was a fairly complicated matter. BAA were renovating both before and after people moved.

The process was ongoing. Terminal 5 was not yet complete. It was always the intention to build T5 in two Phases. The first satellite (main building) was complete.

The second satellite, T5C, was still under construction. When that was complete, the occupancy would be reviewed with British Airways.

Whilst it was agreed that Terminal 5 would always be British Airways, but if in the meantime they had grown to exceed the capacity of T5, they would be re-homed in Terminal 3 on the Western Apron, together with their OneWorld partner.

The pattern worked to was that OneWorld airlines were on the Western Apron and would be complete before the opening of Terminal 2. Most of the Star airlines would be on the Eastern Apron with the SkyTeam and a number of other airlines on the Southern Apron.

8. Cllr. Bains stated that in the past, British Airways used to publish a detailed booklet, which the taxi drivers could pick up, which listed information from which Terminals the flights were departing.

Since the Spanish company Ferrovial had acquired BAA, they had made cutbacks and this booklet ceased to exist as guidance for people.

Simon Baugh agreed to provide a communication update on the airline moves, which listed various other information on flights from the Terminals.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

9. Cllr. Beer referred to Simon Baugh's comment on the Heathrow Report, where it had been stated that the figures for July 2009 had climbed very significantly, no mention had been made to the fact that the probable cause of this was the transfer of considerable British Airways traffic from Gatwick Airport. A request was made for the actual transfer figures, to identify the influence this had. It was understood that this was the major factor. Air traffic was not increasing, it was the fact that Heathrow was getting more of it.

Simon Baugh responded that he was unsure as to whether figures could be provided for passengers who would otherwise have travelled through Gatwick and moved to Heathrow. It certainly seemed that overall, across the BAA airports, not all saw an increase in their traffic. Both Gatwick and Stansted saw a decrease in traffic, whilst Edinburgh and Heathrow saw a large increase. It was also certainly the case that the increases that were seen were relatively small, 0.9% and 0.3% respectively. It was not desirable to make predictions on overall traffic for the coming months, as it was still a very difficult time for the aviation industry.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

Cllr. Beer commented that surely it was easier to grasp the number of flights; this was the concern of the residents on the ground. An aeroplane was still an aeroplane flying overhead, whether it was empty or full.

Mike Forster responded that if more detail was required, there were fewer flights that in previous years as a result of the scheduling.

10. John Gurney stated that he had recently attended a Conference, where the subject of Blight had been raised which was still hanging over the residents of Sipson, due to the proposed Third Runway, and the fact that the scheme had not moved forward. People had been unable to move on with their lives as they were stuck in limbo with HAL due to unresolved issues.

Mike Forster responded that BAA were acutely aware of this fact. Meetings had been held with the local residents to discuss this matter. BAA were keen to get the early release of the Property Market Support Bond (PMSB).

The Air Transport White Paper published in 2003 contained a plan at the back of the document which showed an area shaded in blue which was indicative land-take. From that moment on, anybody who owned a house which sat within that area, was potentially going to be blighted, if they wished to sell their property and move.

BAA therefore released a Bond Scheme, which essentially gave the owner of that Bond a guarantee that if they needed to sell their house, they could pass this Bond on to the next person who purchased the property.

Ultimately, when BAA declared an intention to apply for Planning Application they would be prepared, if requested, to purchase that person's house. If permission was granted, the due process would commence in order for people to manage their lives.

BAA needed to be further forward than they currently were, in order to be able to formalise the intricate planning. BAA had declared earlier and immediately after the announcement made on 15th January 2009 by Geoff Hoon MP when they wrote to all the residents in Sipson, that it was their intention to release the scheme earlier. This had raised expectations. However, it had proved much more difficult to reach that point. BAA had not stopped pushing for this. It was hoped to be able to have this scheme out soon, but it was not yet possible to place a timescale upon it.

11. The Technical Adviser referred to a recent Taxi Trade Liaison meeting he had attended. A point was made by the taxi drivers on the need to be aware of the Terminal changes. The BAA personnel present had produced a quantity of an A5 size flyer which they had periodically circulated. This listed all the changes taking place and from the effective date. This information was freely available.

4293 INTRODUCING HEATHROW'S NEW TERMINAL 2

1. Presentation by Phil Wilbrahim and Duncan Pickard on the new Terminal 2 £1bn development (*enclosed*). A BAA Press Release had been circulated with the Agenda and noted. A DVD was also shown of the proposed development.

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

2. Iain Hope commented that quick access to Heathrow Express and the London Underground had been referred to. He asked if the current 'wormholes' would be retained from Terminal 1 through to the Central Bus Station (CBS).

Mike Forster responded that the whole Central Terminal Area (CTA) was undergoing a multi-planning exercise to establish how this would work by integrating the public transport system. It was proposed to build a public transport interchange so that the services were visible to each other, offering choice to the passenger.

3. Cllr. Forsbrey asked if tests had been undertaken for contaminated land. If so, how much and how many line movements per day would be coming out of there and where would the soil be taken.

Duncan Pickard responded that contaminated land surveys had been undertaken, which had revealed that there was a small amount of contaminated land. More land surveys would be carried out in the future.

There would be approximately 400 lorry movements to dig the excavation, but it had not as yet, been determined where this soil would be removed to.

Phil Wilbrahim commented that there would be 400 lorry movements in total. The proportion of contaminated soil would be sent to a licensed site, which the contractor would find.

4. Virginia Godfrey said that HACAN were concerned about the possibility of the increased number of flights with the introduction of 16 new stands.

Phil Wilbrahim explained that the 16 new stands were being developed within the existing 480,000 cap. It was a development to replace the current infrastructure, not increase capacity.

5. Keith Harlow asked if there would be a loss of car parking spaces at the airport.

Phil Wilbrahim responded that when Terminal 2 closed, the Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP2) would also be demolished. This would naturally reduce the number of car parking spaces available until such time that a new car park was built.

Mike Forster confirmed that there would be a reduction in available car parking spaces but as with flights, the cap on the Terminal 5 car parking spaces would remain.

6. Cllr. Potts commented that apart from the largest shopping centre in Europe, being included as part of the development, what facility had been arranged for increased seating.

Phil Wilbrahim replied that there would be a mix of retail and catering units forming part of the new development, but all built around the seating standards required, with a full seating contingency of approximately 1500 seats plus seating in the Gaterooms.

7. John Gurney asked if the roof would be solar powered with the use of 'grey' water.

Duncan Pickard replied that there would be a number of solar powered roofs.

Phil Wilbrahim confirmed that as with Terminal 5, boreholes would be used.

8. The Chairman asked by taking water from boreholes, was there not a risk of de-stabilising the London Underground tunnel.

Phil Wilbrahim replied that the boreholes in question were 120 metres deep before reaching the necessary chalk. They were all licensed by the Environment Agency for which BAA would need to apply for a licence to use. The boreholes were monitored by the Environment Agency and BAA would be provided with a monthly report as to how much water had been taken from very long way down.

9. Cllr. Beer stated that when the preview exercise was undertaken for Terminal 5, he had made the comment that signage was hardly 'user friendly'. It seemed to be sacrificed for the glory of the construction/engineering of the building. Most of the lettering was very small on the signage. It seemed to be an afterthought. People wanted to see where they were going without the need to walk right up to the sign to read it.

Phil Wilbrahim responded that the signage was being designed thoroughly as part of the main construction of the Terminal 2 building. It was the aim to also receive some natural intuitive wayfinding. The point was taken that the signage must be in the correct place, do a proper job and be passenger effective.

10. Cllr. Cadbury stated firstly, concern on the fact that the presentation given was focused on the building of T2, and as usual, the question of surface access was secondary.

Secondly, the Building Regulations were amended in recent years to make the minimum requirement more generous to take account of the fact that there was insufficient women's toilets in public buildings. Yet, St. Pancras Station, was re-opened recently after refurbishment and there is still a queue for the women's toilets.

In many airports, this is also an issue. It is often the case that women's toilets were designed by men, with minimum space allocated. For non-arguable reasons, women needed more allocation of facilities than men.

Phil Wilbrahim responded that this was a serious point which was being addressed. A check would be made as to the comparable ratio of Ladies/Gentlemen toilets in the plans for the new Terminal 2 development to meet the required standard.

ACTION:
PHIL
WILBRAHIM

11. Mike Forster returned to the subject of surface access. It was important to note that 55 million passengers were currently travelling through the Central Terminal Area T1, T2 and T3. When the main Phase of T2A opens it would be less. T1 and T2 would be replaced by a brand new building. It was acknowledged that good integration to the public transport network was necessary.

12. John Gurney referred to the hand dryers used in the T5 toilets. The inset was placed in such a way that when used, the water came over the top and splashed down the front of people. Could this problem be considered when installing new dryers in T2.

Phil Wilbrahim responded that this observational point would be addressed.

ACTION:
PHIL
WILBRAHIM

4294 HEATHROW EXPRESS/HEATHROW CONNECT SERVICES

1. Introduction and Presentation on the services and structure of fares by Richard Robinson, Managing Director of HEX (*enclosed*).

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

2. Keith Harlow referred to key metrics. He said that the 'arrival on time' was not that impressive of 5-minutes within a 15-minute journey with no stops, against 5-minutes on a four-hour journey. It was not a realistic measurement. If the service was promoted as a 15-minute rail journey into London and yet took 20 minutes, this was not impressive.

Steve Chambers responded that the PPM measure was an accurate measure of accommodation, reliability and arrival on time.

3. Lynette Braithwaite pointed out that the comparison on fares was not good, as a passenger would need to travel to Paddington in London initially to board the Heathrow Express.

Richard Robinson replied that HEX had been working with a company named 'Carbon Voyage' an environmentally friendly taxi service, with a view to maximise capacity and minimise carbon emissions. It was accepted that the location of Heathrow Express was not always the most convenient point to travel from. There were other elements to compensate, such as the ease to board and seat availability with good luggage facilities.

4. John Gurney stated that over the years, when the London Underground infrastructure was not working due to engineering works, HEX had been reluctant to accept the transfer of LUL tickets which had caused a problem for passengers.

Steve Chambers responded that there were planned changes, as this fact was recognised. During the closure of the Piccadilly Line over the last two years, an arrangement was reached. If severe travel disruption is caused, London Underground assist HEX and vice-versa.

Richard Robinson said that HEX was a premium service. If there was any disruption inter-terminal, they would allow passengers to use the service for free. Advice to passengers was also given on the Heathrow Connect service, which was a premium service in and out of London and to be used as such.

5. Isobel Knox asked if consideration had been given to the reduction of fares and revision of frequency in order to encourage more passengers onto the Heathrow Express service.

Richard Robinson replied that the fares were priced on models. To address the perceived problem of high fares, there were random offers available, e.g. children travel free in mid-Summer and various group travel offers.

6. Murad Qureshi thanked the Committee for bringing the Heathrow Express team to the meeting, arising from the questions raised on Capital Investment expenditure programme at the July meeting.

He referred to the pricing structure of the Heathrow Express fares. The one factor which had not been taken on board was the environmental cost. If that was considered, the Heathrow Express service came out looking very good. However, if the HEX was aimed at the business classes, there should surely be a good case to lower the fares and take on board more people.

Clearly, the slots were available when a train travelled to Terminal 5 every 15 minutes. It was surprising that this exercise had not been done, particularly as Mr. Mike Brown at least knew the connectivity between London Underground and Heathrow Express. It was not thought that this had been fully looked into.

Richard Robinson replied that environmentally this was interesting. Obviously, HEX did not force people to use their service, this was by choice. If the price of the fare was really the dominating factor for a passenger, they would use London Underground. If the price was still important, but not as crucial as timing, the Heathrow Connect could be taken.

The range of available services at different price points that were not road was good.

Murad Qureshi responded that simply a £10.00 fare per passenger would take many people and traffic off the road and onto the trains. It was not thought that this proposition had been sufficiently investigated.

The pricing was not a true reflection. People did not wish to pay £16.50 to travel from Paddington to Heathrow on the Heathrow Express. Another example was a £4.90 Heathrow Connect fare to travel from Hayes & Harlington to Heathrow. This was astonishing as it was a distance of only one stop. A price reduction in fares would not only encourage people to use the service to access Heathrow to board a flight, but also staff wishing to travel to the airport to work.

7. Mike Forster stated that this subject was moving onto a surface access strategy rather than a Heathrow Express issue. The assumption was being made around the Great Western mainline. There were only four train paths for Heathrow Express service. BAA had tried to get the Heathrow Connect train paths increased from two to four, but had struggled.

The train paths in this part of England were significantly used. It should not be assumed that there was capacity sitting unused on the main railway line.

8. The Chairman referred to the capacity issue and asked if the trains were full.

Richard Robinson replied that at peak-times the trains were full.

9. Iain Hope representing the London Chamber of Commerce stated that the Heathrow Express service was vital for business travellers and incoming tourists and to take traffic off the road. The tracks from Paddington were as full with traffic as the runways. It was not thought that it would be easy to gain extra tracks and the best that could be hoped for would be to 'tweak' the system with the help of Network Rail.

Mr. Hope said that he had travelled First Class that day on the Heathrow Express and was disappointed that he had observed a decline in the quality of the trains over the past twelve months. The seats were worn, the leather arm rests were cracked and the carpets were stained and dirty throughout the carriage. There was no excuse for this.

Also, the suspension of the train carriage he had travelled in was not good. This was partly due to the state of the carriage itself and partly the rail track. The cleaning problem needed to be addressed. He also asked of the intention with regard to speeding up the refurbishment programme for the trains.

It was therefore urged that as a First Class return fare chargeable on the Heathrow Express is £50.00, the standard of the train was unacceptable to business travellers. It would be desirable to see more people use the service by being attracted to a good standard inside the train.

Mr. Robinson responded that he was very disappointed to learn of the experience of the standard of the Heathrow Express train carriage as outlined by Ian Hope. It was unacceptable, whether it was Standard, Express, or First Class. This matter would be investigated.

ACTION:
RICHARD
ROBINSON

Steve Chambers confirmed that a refurbishment programme had been rolled-out for the seat covers and carpets in the HEX train carriages.

10. Cllr. Forsbrey referred to the proposed Airtrack scheme which would travel twice per hour through Spelthorne. He asked why it would be necessary to travel on the loop from Heathrow to Spelthorne and why it was necessary to change from an overhead to an electrification system with a line-take of 1 Km. This was the current proposal over Staines Moor which was unacceptable. There was no explanation given in the TWA literature that had been distributed as to why it was necessary to take 1 Km.

Steve Chambers responded that the 1 Km line take would be based around line speed.

Mike Forster agreed to investigate how the impact on Staines Moor from an overhead to electrification system could be relieved.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

11. Murad Qureshi said that the observation had been made by HEX that people using the Premier service on the train would not be particularly keen on barriers. He asked how many of the Heathrow Express users were coming off the Tube system.

Richard Robinson replied approximately 40%.

Murad Qureshi estimated this figure would be higher. The passengers were accustomed to using an Oyster card for getting on and off the Tube system which has a set of barriers. It was thought that there would not be a huge issue on that prediction of users of the Heathrow Express, plus it would be convenient for business travellers to use that service.

Richard Robinson responded that this figure was not the opinion of HEX that the customers liked the ability to just walk onto the service. This was surveyed feedback received from the passengers.

12. Mr. Qureshi referred to Crossrail. He asked if BAA would still own the HEX tracks and what would be the arrangement for Hayes & Harlington Station. At present residents had to pay the fare of £4.90 for a one-stop journey, which it was thought must be the most expensive one-stop fare in London, if not the country.

Richard Robinson replied that it was understood that BAA would continue to own the tracks that they currently do.

The wider picture was that to build Heathrow Express it cost £1 billion which was a good investment. However, that investment had to be paid for in some form. The pricing of fares was one way to take this into account.

13. John Gurney referred to the subject of barriers. He thought that one point that was being overlooked, was the fact that the users of Heathrow Express were more likely to be carrying baggage. To access through the barriers on the London Underground was difficult.

Staff who worked at the airport would ideally like to see a connection from Staines into Heathrow, so that it would not be necessary to use cars.

14. The Technical Adviser stated that some years ago, when the legislation was passed for the construction/operation of Heathrow Express, it specifically designated what was then, the London Passengers' Committee as being the Court of Appeal for dissatisfied customers. This was now known as London TravelWatch. HACC had an agreement with them that they would keep the Committee informed of any problems with Heathrow Express that were brought to their attention.

The Technical Adviser asked if HEX had any such role in relation to London TravelWatch.

Steve Chambers responded that HEX had relations with them and stayed in regular contact over the past few years. However, as to the former agreement made between HACC and London TravelWatch, it would be necessary to investigate this matter further.

ACTION:
STEVE
CHAMBERS

4295 AIRSPACE CAPACITY IN THE SOUTH-EAST

1. Presentation on airspace capacity by Phil Roberts, Assistant Director of Airspace Policy, CAA. Implications for development, airport capacity, Competition Commission decisions, environmental impact of aviation CO2 emissions in climb/descent issues etc. (*enclosed*).

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

2. The Chairman said that he was surprised it was clear Government policy that noise should be concentrated rather than to disperse it.

Mr. Roberts confirmed that as it currently stood, the CAA operated from within the Transport Act under the Air Navigation Direction which was issued. Associated with those, was guidance on how the environmental duties should be performed. This was available on both the DfT and CAA website. Concentration was the policy.

3. Margaret Majumdar referred to the second consultation in the latter part of this year. In Ealing, the residents were concerned at the effect of PR-Nav which had been included in the original consultation. This would concentrate the noise even more, not over a 3 Km distance, but on a straight line.

At the last meeting of HACC in July 2009, it was explained that the DfT and BAA intended to introduce TED (Tactically Enhanced Departures) in 6-9 months time. This would involve aeroplanes taking-off to the East from both runways at the same time during part of the day. The flight paths from the two runways met over Hanger Lane in NW10. Once the aeroplanes reached Ealing, they were so close together on each runway, that any alternation was not tremendously effective.

It was hoped that some account might be taken of the alternation pattern when this was finally introduced.

Phil Roberts responded that it was the intention of the CAA to put their consultation out before the end of the year with an initial document, which would set out that which they were trying to achieve within the Heathrow airspace strategy. It was not specific to Heathrow or even the South-East. It was a national policy for the whole of the UK.

The questions asked on PR-Nav and the implications of that were part of the issues addressed in the strategy, but the ‘specifics’ of the Heathrow operation were not included as far as they were concerned.

4. Murad Qureshi had observed that much of the presentation was based on a national Parliamentary process. He asked what process would be put in place for a regional Parliamentary process. For example the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson was against the expansion of Heathrow.

Murad Qureshi asked when the London Assembly could expect to receive a presentation.

Phil Roberts replied that there would be more discussions on the airspace strategy in the next 5-6 weeks. This would be the catalyst for a formal discussion. There was a statutory requirement to consult with the GLA about changes contemplated by NATS to deal with airspace problems.

4296 FRANKFURT AIRPORT TRAFFIC RESULTS 2008

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC. 565**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. These results provided some factual information relevant to the position of Frankfurt Airport as probably the major competitor to Heathrow Airport in Europe.

4297 ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF HUB AIRPORTS

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC. 557**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. This summarised the conclusions of the report published by the British Chamber of Commerce, another in a long line of such reports, and updates some earlier conclusions which had caused controversy.

4298 GUIDELINES FOR AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

1. The current Guidelines were published by the Department for Transport in December 2003, as a necessary, more comprehensive and updated aid (copy circulated with Agenda), but because of the many changes affecting the composition, appointing of Members, the complexity of matters affecting their business since then, any justification for amending them is being considered by the Department for Transport. Members will be aware of one possible and controversial change to the business and role of Consultative Committees deriving from meetings and debates held with HACC Members, about a disturbing proposal that the respected Air Transport Users Council’s role should be taken over by the “Passenger Focus” organisation, which currently, had only experience of rail passenger matters, but could be represented by some linked passenger panels at airports.

The 2009 Annual Meeting of all UK Consultative Committees held in Belfast discussed the proposal with the DfT sponsor and made it very clear to him of their united opposition to reduction of their Committee’s role by some unqualified appointee and the resultant confusion.

The HACC position of opposition was made clear at subsequent meetings with the Civil Aviation Authority's staff dealing with improving passenger experience. BAA had published its position supporting the proposal generally and the establishment of Passenger Panels at larger airports, which the Chairman of the PSSC was concerned to note at the HACC meeting on 29th July 2009, as it seemed to suggest that BAA was not satisfied with the performance of our Passenger Services Sub-Committee (PSSC).

The Committee has been informed of the proposed changes several times and had expressed its opposition. Any need for change and how it might be accomplished was being led by our own DfT liaison officer, Frank Evans.

2. The Chairman agreed to defer this item until the 2nd December 2009 meeting for a further debate. The Committee still had concerns on Passenger Focus as against the Air Transport Users' Committee (AUC) and against the Passenger Services Sub-Committee and the Committee objected to PSSC's role being rejected in any way.

Frank Evans was asked to outline the work currently being undertaken on this subject.

Mr. Evans said that the Department for Transport issued Guidelines on the way a Consultative Committee should operate. The current Guidelines were produced in 2003. It was proposed to re-visit the Guidelines to see what changes could be made.

4299 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee held on 29th July 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. John Gurney reported that firstly, there was concern shown by the members at the PSSC meeting held on the morning of 23rd September 2009, at the proposal for automatic bio-metric gates at Heathrow Airport in regard to the time delay at processing passengers through Security and the issues which this could generate.

Secondly, the 555/557 bus service was no longer run by National Express. It had been tendered to another company. The punctuality of the service was extremely poor, and it was one of the worst at the airport. Surrey County Council would be reviewing the service next year. It was the only bus service which travelled from South-West of Surrey to the airport and if that service was lost it would cause problems for passengers.

4300 PASSENGER EXPERIENCE – CONSULTATION BY THE UK BORDERS AGENCY

1. Following an undertaking given by Philip Astle, the head of the UKBA at Heathrow, in his recent discussion with HACC, to liaise more closely with the Committee about their activities at Heathrow as they mature after the amalgamation, and because of public concern about some measures to obtain, keep and use personal data, the Agency wrote to the Committee on 12th August last, describing what they were contemplating doing for automatic clearance of incoming passengers at Heathrow. This consultation was initially considered at the morning meeting of PSSC on 23rd September 2009. Consultation letter had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

4301 “BAA BOUNCES BACK”

1. BAA had experienced a transformation under Chairman Sir Nigel Rudd who took the helm two years ago. Article from interview with ‘Future Airport’ publication had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

4302 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report and Borough Noise Line Figures for Quarter 2 (April-June 2009) and LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for Quarter 2 (April-June 2009) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4303 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for July and August 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4304 DRAFT NOISE ACTION PLAN RESPONSE

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.566**) which had been tabled, summarised the various presentations to HACC Members, what the Noise Directive requires, advised what BAA cannot be expected to include, and suggested a “straw man” response for Members to amend.

(Secretary’s Note): Five responses had since been received from Isobel Knox (IATA) on behalf of British Airways, Margaret Majumdar on behalf of EANAG and John Stewart on behalf of HACAN/Clearskies and Cllr. Malcolm Beer on behalf of the RB Windsor & Maidenhead and LAANC for consideration of the HACC response.

2. Margaret Majumdar referred to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Technical Adviser’s Report where it was stated that certain areas were not within BAA’s capacity. Whilst this was technically true, it was thought to be naïve to say this and therefore HACC did not need to comment upon it. The Members were well aware that BAA worked very closely with the DfT and had a joint Working Party on the development of R3. Although they may not have direct responsibility for many areas, they certainly had considerable influence on the DfT and there should be reference in the HACC response to those areas of concern.

It was suggested that the items on pages 8 and 9 should be included in the HACC response.

Margaret Majumdar said on the Conclusions, she disagreed with the first sentence of paragraph 10. The Draft Noise Action Plan did not allow at all for what the European Directive asked, because the requirement on the action was to improve the climate around London airport, where it was necessary. The implications, certainly of the EU work was that this was necessary at 55 decibels Lden.

It was thought that the Members would have noticed that every time there was a minor action to amend, it was referred to the area it was expected to affect and would restrict the area greatly. Nothing had been proposed for the area of 55 dBA.

Most people were unaware of the consultation. Not enough notification had been given to the residents of the proposals.

It was thought that the Committee should ‘beef up’ their response to the BAA Draft Noise Action Plan, despite what the Technical Adviser had put forward.

3. The Technical Adviser stated that he wished to make it clear that the content of the report was to draw attention to what had not been received from any Member of the Committee and to where it could or should have been made. Some of the comments by Margaret Majumdar had been alluded to in the report, but it also stated that there were mis-apprehensions about whether BAA had the ability or control over those and suggested that was a provision for tasks which should have been done or included whether by other authorities or not.

A further request was made to the Members who had concern to submit a response in writing to the Secretariat as previously asked.

Although the degree of consultation had been complained of, it was thought to be unrealistic to expect that the hundreds of thousands of people who may have a view on this subject could be contacted individually.

In terms of consultation, there had been sessions held for public awareness and the local residents, much of which had been organised by BAA.

4. Frank Evans commented that if people thought that the consultation had not been made clear enough they should state this, as at the end of the day BAA had to produce a Noise Action Plan and the Secretary of State would decide whether to adopt that plan.
5. Simon Baugh asked the Members if they had recommendations to send these in for inclusion in the response.
6. Margaret Majumdar agreed to re-submit a revised response to the Secretary, on behalf of EANAG.

ACTION:
MARGARET
MAJUMDAR

7. Cllr. Beer said that the RB Windsor & Maidenhead Cabinet would be discussing the subject on 24th September 2009. However, the indications were that the plan did not seek positive measures to reduce noise, which it should do. The framework of it and the control measures were very vague. It seemed to be inadequate for the purpose and the opinion seemed to be coming forward that this should be reconsidered. The other factor of grave concern was the whole principle whereby the ‘poacher had been appointed as the gamekeeper’. This seemed to be wrong. It was thought that the RB Windsor & Maidenhead would be challenging this fact.
8. The Chairman said that a response would be submitted on behalf of the Committee on the basis of those views received from the Members.
9. Cllr. Cadbury commented that as previously stated in relation to consultation, whilst the HACC meetings had value to the Member organisations, it was not seen as necessary for the Technical Adviser to ‘chase up’ independent responses. All the organisations present at the meeting would be submitting a response in their own right which would be articulate and well informed.

Given the very different perspectives, the Consultative Committee was not the appropriate place to try to put together a unified response. The Committee should be used for what it was good at and not to make it do something which was impossible.

10. Frank Evans commented that the Defra Guidelines for the Noise Action Plan did stipulate that the response should be through the Committee on behalf of its Member organisations.
11. The Chairman further added that if the HACC did not submit a response on behalf of its Members, it would not show it in a very good light.
12. The Technical Adviser explained that the Committee should put up a response which was a positive contribution and an assessment of the various problems which the Committee Members were concerned about, not their constitutional organisations. They had to be balanced with several other views which may well be conflicting, in which case this would need to be drawn attention to.

4305 NEWS RELEASES

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

4306 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. There were no further items to discuss and the Chairman closed the meeting at 4.30 p.m.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY 2nd DECEMBER 2009 (SEMINAR)

DATES OF 2010 MEETINGS:

WEDNESDAY 3rd FEBRUARY 2010

WEDNESDAY 31st MARCH 2010

WEDNESDAY 2nd JUNE 2010

WEDNESDAY 4th AUGUST 2010

WEDNESDAY 29th SEPTEMBER 2010

WEDNESDAY 8th DECEMBER 2010 (SEMINAR)

