

## HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the Meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> March 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. Mohammed Khursheed	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Josephine Barrett	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Jim Maddan	-	LB Wandsworth
Cllr. Martin Elengorn	-	LB Richmond upon Thames
Cllr. Patrick Roberts	-	Runnymede BC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Dev Dhillon	-	South Bucks DC
Alison Marcroft (Deputy)	-	London Assembly
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Isobel Knox (Deputy)	-	IATA
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Colin Mitchell	-	Independent

#### HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Mike Brown	-	Chief Operating Officer
Simon Baugh	-	Director of Airport Communications

#### PRESENTERS

Jon Proudlove	-	NATS
---------------	---	------

#### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

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

1. Mike Forster (BAA), Cllr. Balvinder Bains (Slough BC), Cllr. James Walsh (Slough BC), Cllr. Christopher Turrell (Bracknell Forest BC), Cllr. Ruth Cadbury (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Felicity Barwood (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey (LB Hounslow), Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy) (RB Windsor & Maidenhead), Cllr. Christopher Turrell (Bracknell Forest BC), Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos (Surrey County Council), Cllr. Nicholas Botterill (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Philip Carlisle (GTMC), John Gurney (TUC ), Lynette Braithwaite (AUC), Steve Ronald (IATA), Susan Laurie (Independent).

#### 4235 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2009 were agreed.

#### **4236 MATTERS ARISING**

**(a) Minute 4221 – Use of Freedom Cards on the Heathrow Connect service.**

1. Mike Brown would continue work in progress on this matter.

**(b) Minute 4221 – Provide one-page summary listing current and future consultations.**

1. The response from BAA was tabled as *enclosed* summary note.

**(c) Minute 4224 – DfT to provide map of the SIDS for Northern Runway departures on easterlies.**

1. The Department for Transport had provided this information (*enclosed*).

**(d) Minute 4224 – Respond to DEFRA PM10 Particulate Consultation.**

1. The response letter had been circulated with the Agenda.
2. Virginia Godfrey was concerned that an extension of time in which to meet the limit value for particulate matter in certain zones had been sought. This could set a precedent. There were already existing concerns on the local environment with regard to air quality and nitrogen dioxide.
3. Rob Gibson stated that DEFRA had started the process of applying for an extension of time in which to meet the limit values. He also shared Virginia Godfrey's concerns. The limits had already been exceeded. This was not a unique situation to Heathrow, but at the same time, various parties had since 1995 to sort the matter out, but nothing had happened.
4. Simon Baugh commented that this did not have any impact on the operation of a third runway.
5. The Chairman asked if a report could be prepared on the issues for a future meeting.

The Technical Adviser stated that instead of a report, a presentation would be made on this topic, hopefully at the June meeting from Roger Gardner, who used to deal with air quality for the Department for Transport. He had previously addressed the Committee on this subject at a HACCC Seminar some years ago.

He now ran an organisation named Omega. They had been carrying out studies around Heathrow Airport up until recently and would disclose to the Committee the results of their studies.

The PM10s had not arisen as an issue, compared to other pollutants

such as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide which had been the cause for concern in the public's attention. Although PM10s could not be ignored, up until now, there did not seem to be any evidence to show that PM10 was a problem at Heathrow.

Martin Capstick, Head of Aviation Environment Division at the DfT had recently addressed the residents at a BAA Local Focus Forum meeting. He was very positive on the fact that the greatest contributor to pollution in the area around the airport was from road traffic and not the airport activity. He had commented that this was not surprising, given the proximity of the M4, M25, A31 and the A4 Bath Road.

It was hoped that Roger Gardner could bring clarity on this topic when he presents to the Committee.

6. Rob Gibson suggested that representatives from DEFRA should attend the June HACC meeting.. They were responsible for preparing and issuing the papers on this matter. In terms of meeting the obligations, it was shared between DEFRA and the DfT.

It was thought that whilst Roger Gardner (Omega) was a knowledgeable person in terms of technology and research, it would be helpful to hear from DEFRA themselves directly.

Contact details of the person at DEFRA responsible for this topic would be provided to the Secretary.

**ACTION:**  
**ROB**  
**GIBSON**

- (e) **Minute 4231 – Provide scheduled arrival and departure times of the four A380s currently operating from Heathrow.**

1. The response from BAA was tabled as *enclosed* summary note.

- (f) **Minute 4231 – Provide QC of A380s on arrival and departure compared to 747s (this is the subject of a report on the Agenda – see Item 12).**

1. This was the subject of a Report on the Agenda – see Item 12.

- (g) **Minute 4234 – Provide a summary of total monies given by BAA to charity, local communities, S106 Agreements and local business groups.**

1. The response from BAA was tabled as *enclosed* summary note.

#### **4237 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT**

1. The Chairman announced that Pieter Betlem, a long-standing Advisory Panel Member of the Passenger Sub-Committee had retired from the Committee after 38 years of service, at the age of 82, due to ill health. The Secretary would send a letter of thanks to Pieter on behalf of the Members.

**ACTION:**  
**SECRETARY**

It was also announced that sadly, Tony Lucking, former AUC Member had died.

He had served several years on the Committee, prior to relinquishing his seat in 2005.

‘The Times’ newspaper had published an interesting Obituary on Tony’s career.

The Chairman welcomed Isobel Knox to the meeting as Deputy IATA Member to Steve Ronald, who was the replacement for Paul Ellis on the Committee, who had left British Airways in December 2008.

The Chairman advised the Members that the HACC Office would be moving at the beginning of June 2009 to the Compass Centre. However, the HACC meetings would continue to be held at Heathrow Point West for a possible further three months or until the Conference Rooms were available at the Compass Centre.

#### **4238 HEATHROW MANAGEMENT MATTERS**

1. (a) Dialogue with Mr. Mike Brown, Chief Operating Officer of Heathrow Airport.  
(b) BAA Heathrow Update and Statistical Information had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

Mr. Brown presented his Heathrow Update report with Simon Baugh (*enclosed*).

2. Simon Baugh also advised that there would be a period of suspension to runway alternation during the Night Period. This was currently scheduled to take effect from 27<sup>th</sup> April 2009 to 10<sup>th</sup> September 2009. As part of the Eastern Apron development (Heathrow East), works will be undertaken on the taxiways. Part of that programme required the new taxiways to be linked to the runway at access points North of the Southern Runway (27L).

For safety reasons, this work could not be carried out next to a live runway. Therefore, it will be carried out at night, in sections, over a period of time. This will mean that from 11.00 p.m. until 6.00 a.m. whether on easterly or westerly operations, the Northern Runway would be used for all landings during the weekday Night Period. At the weekend, the majority of landings will use the Southern Runway, to enable routine maintenance work to take place on the Northern Runway during that period.

BAA acknowledged that there was concern in the community on alternation and tried to keep periods of suspension to alternation to an absolute minimum. Letters would shortly be sent to all stakeholders, members of the Local Focus Forum and Noise & Track Keeping Working Group, local MPs and Councillors. Advertisements would also be taken out in local newspapers of the areas that the suspension would affect, as well as publishing the information on the BAA website and placing an article in the Community Newsletter, ‘Heathrow Inform’.

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

3. Iain Hope reported that the London Chamber of Commerce continued to receive praise for the Terminal 5 development from members and passengers. It was thought that tremendous progress had been made after the initial unfortunate events, during the first two weeks of operation.

A request had been made relating to Terminal 5, where it was suggested that large analogue clocks be installed in the Terminal in certain key places. The passengers were finding it difficult to determine the exact time, as only small digital clocks were available on the check-in desks.

It was important to everybody that the passengers arrived well in time and did not delay flights and cause disruption, particularly later in the evening, which caused disturbance to the local residents.

With regard to Terminal 1, the improvements which had been made to the lighting and other features were appreciated.

However, Terminal 3 was rather depressing. Whilst it was acknowledged that BAA had Capital restraints and difficulties relating to ownership, a request was made to investigate the possibility of improving the atmosphere without vast sums of money being spent, particularly the check-in facility, which was gloomy.

Mike Brown thanked Iain Hope for the constructive comment regarding Terminal 5. He undertook to investigate the sensible suggestion of analogue clocks in the Terminals.

**ACTION:**  
**MIKE**  
**BROWN**

It was agreed that Terminal 1 had certainly improved, with more works still in progress. The next major shift of airlines would see Lufthansa moving in before the Summer peak. This would get Terminal 1 back up to fuller usage again.

With regard to Terminal 3, it was agreed that improvement could be made. The check-in area was programmed for refurbishment. The areas of Zones F and G, where Iberia and British Airways had moved into had undergone a refurbishment prior to their arrival, which looked very good.

It was to this standard that BAA were aiming for the remainder of the check-in area. Terminal 3 was a particular challenge, because of the sheer space constraints within the check-in area.

There was a clear plan in place to improve the seating capacity of the Departure Lounge by moving some of the Retail units, to ensure that adequate seating was available.

4. Keith Harlow asked if in light of the economic downturn, BAA had to make a revision to the Capital Expenditure Programme (CAPEX).

Mr. Brown replied that no, BAA did not have to make a revision on the Capital Expenditure. Like many companies across the World, who spent millions of pounds every year on re-building facilities, BAA were and continued to do so. The evidence could be seen with Terminal 2 being re-constructed and Terminal 5C well under construction, scheduled for opening in June 2010. The shareholders committed to and proceeded with that work. The view of BAA was that the downturn in passenger numbers to Heathrow was short-term. There was nothing other than compelling evidence that air travel would increase in years to come.

Mr. Brown said that he was determined that Heathrow Airport would be fit for purpose to play its part in ensuring that the UK was properly connected to the World.

5. Cllr. Khursheed referred to the Final Report published by the Competition Commission on the BAA Airports. He asked for the position of BAA on the findings in the Report, or if it was too early to comment. It was understood that BAA had two months to lodge an Appeal if they were not happy with the decisions made.

Mike Brown responded that it was clear that it was a large Report and one where BAA only had a limited few days in which to read it and absorb the findings. BAA maintained the view that the arguments put forward by the Competition Commission were flawed. Nonetheless, BAA had acknowledged and demonstrated the political and public opinion of the findings within the Report. Indeed, that led to the BAA Board launching the sale of Gatwick Airport in advance of the Final Report being issued. That sale process continues.

Clearly, with regard to the other Recommendations in the Report, as outlined in the Heathrow Report Summary, it would be inappropriate to pre-empt the final assessment by BAA. The management were giving the Report its fullest attention. The conclusion would emerge in due course.

6. Rob Gibson referred to the de-icer incident at Mayfield Farm featured in the Heathrow Report. He said that certain local authorities had also received complaints of a smell in the vicinity (Glycol). It was suggested that in future, if such a situation arose, it would be helpful if BAA Public Affairs could notify the affected local authorities and HACCC to make them aware, so that they did not waste time in trying to find the source of the problem.

Mike Brown agreed to this suggestion.

**ACTION:**  
**PUBLIC**  
**AFFAIRS**

7. The Technical Adviser referred to this topic. He said that he had undertaken considerable work during the past few years on this subject. He had worked with a firm that had developed a very safe de-icer as a substitute for both Urea and Glycol, which took on board some of the new liquids introduced from acetates particularly, and those which were made from the residue of the materials used by Brewers and other food manufacturers. They were acceptable because they did not pollute potable water supplies.

The Technical Adviser continued that he had, several years ago discussions with a member of the BAA Corporate Team who held the responsibility of the monitoring of de-icing materials and the testing and introduction of these.

It was hoped that BAA continued to look at new materials and encouraged the use of these acetates, rather than Glycol.

The suggestion was made that it would be helpful if BAA were able to give the Committee a note on the current situation on the use of Glycol levels, to be satisfied that the situation was improving. There were other materials to use from manufacturers e.g. B.P., Clearway and Kilfrost.

Mike Brown agreed to provide this note.

**ACTION:**  
**MIKE**  
**BROWN**

8. Cllr. Trussler asked how many Apprentices were appointed by BAA at the Apprenticeship Fair in February 2009.

Helen Nation undertook to determine the exact number and report back with the findings.

**ACTION:**  
**HELEN**  
**NATION**

**4239 FINAL REPORT OF THE COMPETITION COMMISSION “MARKET INVESTIGATION OF BAA AIRPORTS”**

1. This matter had been discussed under Minute 4238.

**4240 DISRUPTION TO OPERATIONS AT HEATHROW AIRPORT DUE TO UNUSUAL SNOWFALL**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.549**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

**4241 FINAL REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PANEL ON AIRPORT REGULATION**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.554**) had been tabled and was noted.
2. The Technical Adviser stated that the Members of HACC had considered an interim report several meetings ago, which revealed an ignorance of the existence and role of Airport Consultative Committees.

Following that, a response letter had been sent to the CAA on behalf of the Committee, to express the doubts about the decisions that had been taken and their competence to do this.

Having looked at their latest 2,500 page Report, it was understood that there were five people on the Airport Panel of the Competition Commission who had been taking the decisions. None of them had experience in the airport or aviation industry. They were all Economists or Accountants. Yet, the prime purpose of their decision on BAA would deprive a Private Company of their asset property on some very dubious proposals and conclusions. The Competition Commission had continued to stress the need to only introduce competition, but did not state where that competition was likely to come from.

It was not the airports who provide the competition as the Competition Commission seemed to imagine, it was the airlines who could be attracted to serve those airports. With the history at the airports over the past several years and the present 'credit crunch' where traffic numbers were decreasing and airlines were either going bankrupt or merging, this did not give any cause to believe that competition would develop at either Stansted or Gatwick with Heathrow Airport.

It was hoped that the Committee would agree that a response should be sent to the Competition Commission in much the same terms as had already been written. That is, throwing into doubt generally, the conclusions and the likely disruption for air transport during the next few years.

3. Roger Wiltshire commented that this 'old chestnut' had been raised by the Technical Adviser before. Whilst his personal feelings were welcomed on this debate, everyone must recognise that Economists do have an understanding of the economy, more broadly than many of the Committee Members in general. A simple way of challenging this was a debate based on economic arguments. It was not thought that it warranted the HACC to make a decision on this and should therefore not waste time discussing the matter, least of all writing to the CAA again.
4. Simon Baugh advised that following the publication of the CAA's Final Report, it was not open to consultation. It was only open to BAA to appeal the decision made if they should wish and follow a legal process.

#### **4242 FRAMEWORK FOR THE ECONOMIC REGULATION OF UK AIRPORTS**

1. Proposals intended to put the passenger experience at the centre of regulatory decision-making processes, as well as emphasizing the environment, financeability and the principles of Better Regulation.  
Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.554**) had been tabled and was noted.

#### **4243 DfT RESEARCH REPORT "AIR PASSENGER EXPERIENCE AT HEATHROW, GATWICK, STANSTED AND MANCHESTER AIRPORTS"**

1. This follows a personal consultation by Catherine Abbott of the CAA with HACC at a Committee meeting.  
Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.554**) had been tabled and was noted.
2. The Chairman asked Andy Hull for feedback arising from the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee on the morning of 25<sup>th</sup> March 2009, surrounding the issues in Minute 4241, 4242 and 4243 (Agenda Items 8, 9 & 10).

Andy Hull advised that the members had discussed this in detail and suggestions were made, but there was no definite agreement on forward action.

3. Susan Parsons commented that the PSSC had stream-lined the complaints procedure. In the past, the Committee had looked at individual complaints, whereas now they were concentrating far more on the wider issues and trying to make improvements in those areas which had been flagged up by the complaints.

As such, there was a feeling amongst the members of the Committee that they welcomed the consultation.

It was correct to say that the Committee did not take a formal vote on this, but it did encapsulate that the majority of members felt that they welcomed the opportunity to work with the CAA on the 'Air Passenger Experience' with a view to making further improvements, to assist the smooth flow of passengers through the airport. Ultimately, the air passenger was the most important person.

4. The Technical Adviser referred to the comment made by Susan Parsons at the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee, relating to doubts about Passenger Focus' being the ultimate responsibility. He asked for further comment on this aspect.

Susan Parsons replied that the Air Transport User's Committee (AUC) had built up much experience over the years. There was suggestion that it should be subsumed into 'Passenger Focus'. The AUC was funded by the airline industry, whereas 'Passenger Focus' was funded by the Taxpayer.

It was therefore wondered, how the airlines would feel about cross-subsidy going into other areas which are considered by 'Passenger Focus'. It was thought that a very careful look needed to be given to the whole area. Whilst the AUC did a good job, it may be better if it were subsumed. However, a decision should not be rushed into, stating that it was either a good idea or not, but to look very closely at the matter.

5. The Chairman asked if the members of the PSSC thought that it would be a good idea if they could hold a general discussion on the issues with a representative from the CAA.

Andy Hull agreed that this would be useful.

6. The Chairman asked if any other members were interested on the subject of the 'Air Passenger Experience' as to who should be the body handling complaints. Whilst it would not be desirable to lose the HACC PSSC role, at the same time, it might be improved by working with others.

Isobel Knox responded that the airlines felt very strongly that they did represent the passenger interest well at the moment and were very keen to be part of the process. They would not wish to see the direction of airports in terms of passenger service, being taken over by many different 'quangos'. It was not thought that the DfT had fully recognised that in their final consultation, therefore the airlines would be making this point.

The 'Passenger Focus' was very much based on the rail industry and had currently no knowledge at all on air transport. Much of their work related to train operating companies rather than the rail track itself. It was uncertain as to how much work they did on the infrastructure side equivalent to the airports.

It was not known that if the AUC were subsumed into 'Passenger Focus' how it would work and who would pay for this. There were a number of issues that needed to be worked through. A conversation would be very helpful with the CAA in which the airlines could be directly involved.

7. Andy Hull stated that the CAA report had recommended that the passenger representation in the PSSC should be strengthened. It had suggested that more Independent members might be appointed to look after that aspect.

The Passenger Services Sub-Committee were currently two Independent members down on the normal quota. At times, it was a struggle to get all the work completed, including the Terminal Monitoring Exercises.

8. The Technical Adviser referred to **HACC 554**. He said that there was a great deal of uncertainty as to what and how far some of these measures would be put in. The PSSC had looked at the more important paragraphs of the report, where it was noted that the CAA had proposed that passenger representation could be improved, to put pressure on service providers to improve key areas of the 'Through Airport Experience'.

The CAA had stated that they had been in discussion with BAA on certain measures which would enhance the role of the PSSC and of the HACC itself.

The report referred to various surveys currently being undertaken, the results of which were expected in the next month or two.

There was much debate in the report, which the members needed explanation of before they could consider the proposal and how it would affect the Committee.

The report had stated that the number of complaints received from air travel exceeded those received in other sectors of the UK economy.

Therefore, the PSSC had an important role to play in this. The CAA were proposing that this role be strengthened.

The Technical Adviser said that his Recommendation relating to holding objections was purely to try to draw out the timescale and activity, to enable more information to be obtained, so that the members could understand exactly what was envisaged regarding HACC and its role. In certain areas, it did look as if HACC could be superseded by some of the proposals, although it was not at all clear.

It was anticipated that if the Recommendation set out in the Technical Adviser's Report were accepted, that the Committee could talk to the CAA, either at his level or seeking meetings with a small number of members of the Committee who were interested in this matter, to see what they could form from it, and whether it was necessary to submit stronger objections or whether they would be satisfied with the proposals. Currently, there were too many unanswered questions.

9. Andy Hull referred to another CAA policy document which had been published in January 2009 which the Committee had not yet seen. Within this document, was the proposal for strengthening the support through the Working Group for passenger representation.

The Technical Adviser responded that this was another example of the uncertainty that needed to be cleared up before the Committee could reach a definite conclusion.

10. The Chairman agreed that a meeting should be arranged with the relevant people at the CAA and representatives from the PSSC and the airlines should take this matter forward.

**ACTION:**  
**SECRETARIAT**

11. Isobel Knox said that she understood the Consumer Protection Group and 'Passenger Focus' were in existence, partly to guide the CAA. If the Economic Regulation Group were spoken to it might be found that they had a different attitude to 'Passenger Focus'. There were many people involved.
12. The Technical Adviser pointed out that one of the problems was the fact that if the CAA or the DfT were responsible for setting up a body and nominating the representatives on it, there would be no idea who these would be or their experience. The Members of the HACC were in better contact and more knowledgeable as to the working of Heathrow Airport than many of the possible nominees might be from these other bodies.

The Technical Adviser continued that the Competition Commission was a prime example of that. He thought that their members were totally unsuitable on the decision of this question as covered in the report, as none of them had anything to do with the air transport industry. Therefore, how would they be expected to know the consequences of their actions.

Also, where did they expect the competition to arise from. This had been tried at some other airports and given the current economic circumstances, it was unlikely that competition would arise in the foreseeable future.

13. The Chairman stated that Isobel Knox had suggested that the Committee dealt with the Consumer Branch of the CAA, rather than the Economic Regulation Branch on this issue.

The Technical Adviser agreed that Catherine Abbott, Head of Consumer Affairs Division at the CAA had written the report and dealt with the Committee previously on this issue and was the prime point of contact.

**4244 DEFRA; CONSULTATION ON FURTHER AMENDMENTS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2006**

Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.553**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

1. The Chairman stated that the Members were asked to support the position in Paragraphs 8-13 of **HACC 553**.
2. The Technical Adviser commented that as he had stated in Paragraph 13 of his report he had no further recommendations to make to the Committee. However, several Members who had views were invited to put these forward so that a formal response could be submitted before the 11<sup>th</sup> May 2009 deadline.
3. Virginia Godfrey referred to Question 3 on page 9 of the report.

***Do you agree with the proposal to revoke the specific duty on the Secretary of State to publish Guidance in Regulation 14(1) and to replace this with a general power to publish Guidance?***

Virginia thought that the answer to this question should be ‘no’. The Committee did not agree.

4. Margaret Majumdar agreed with Virginia Godfrey.
5. Isobel Knox stated that in Question 2.2, it implied that the current duty was to publish Guidance, not to set limits. The proposed amendment would be the power to publish Guidance.
6. Simon Baugh stated that his understanding of this would be to broaden the powers of the Secretary of State and therefore strengthen them.
7. Virginia Godfrey said that she understood this paragraph meant that the range of the powers of the Secretary of State would be widened without tightening.
8. The Technical Adviser said that it may not be clear to the Members, but the Secretary of State referred to was the Secretary of State for Defra, (Department of Environment, Food & Rural Affairs), not the Secretary of State for Transport. It was a Department different to that which the Committee would usually talk with.
9. Roger Wiltshire said that on reading the proposed amendment,, it did imply that there was a broadening without weakening of the powers of the Secretary of State, although it may not tighten them. More detail would be needed to be able to comment
10. Virginia Godfrey stated that the proposed amendment was worrying and would write to the HACC Secretary to outline the concerns of HACAN/Clearskies.

**ACTION:**  
**VIRGINIA**  
**GODFREY**

**(Secretary’s Note):** A Paper outlining the concerns of HACAN/Clearskies has been received which will be incorporated in the HACC response.

11. Margaret Majumdar referred to the second bullet point in paragraph 6.

***Do you agree with the proposal to revoke the duty as regards consolidated noise maps in respect of any area?***

Margaret thought that it implied that a power was to be granted to the Secretary of State, rather than a duty.

The Technical Adviser responded that if the Secretary of State had a power, it would be up to him whether he decided to use it or not. If it was a duty, he must produce noise maps.

**4245 QUOTA COUNT CLASSIFICATIONS OF AIRBUS A.380 COMPARED TO BOEING B.747**

Report by Technical Adviser (**HACC.552**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

1. The Technical Adviser said he thought it would be a good opportunity for those Members who did not have experience in this aspect of the work of the Committee, to be able to see the official description and Quota Limits from the NATS AIP as attached to the Report. It was hoped that this information would give a better understanding.

**4246 AIRPORT AIRSIDE PASSES – CRIMINAL RECORD CHECKS – FOREIGN NATIONALS**

Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC. 548**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

1. The Chairman stated that the Technical Adviser has recommended that Option 4 in the Report should be followed by the Committee.

The Members were asked if they had comments on this.

2. Isobel Knox stated that she had briefly spoken to British Airways Security on this matter. It was not clear to British Airways that Option 4 was necessarily workable. They would like to work with the DfT in more detail on this.

However, the main concern was that the Department for Transport had to take account of the practicalities of this new process. When employing new staff, it was not desirable to have a new process hold the matter up indefinitely, or for it to be a bar of employing people of certain nationalities through no fault of their own. British Airways would like the Government to take that into account and to make sure that the proposal was workable and did not discriminate against employees.

The other concern was that some of the countries that would be worked with did not keep computerised records and it would prove very difficult to get the necessary information. One way forward would be to start with the European Union and possibly the United States, where checks could be made in those countries from Police records. This could be done in phases rather than all at once.

It was thought that there were very big issues concerning these proposals and that it was a political ‘hot potato’. Therefore, it would not be desirable for the Government to rush into new Rules without consideration.

IATA did not object to supporting Option 4 from HACC, but if the Committee agreed, the point could be made regarding the practicalities and a possible phased roll-out programme.

IATA supported the Recommendation that the Government should bear the costs, with the DfT completing the process work as opposed to the airlines. It would be completely unworkable for the airlines to take on this responsibility.

3. The Technical Adviser stated that in recommending Option 4, it was assumed that the DfT would take account of the points made by Isobel Knox. It was thought that they would be in a better negotiating position to obtain the required information from abroad. The DfT would be bound by national legislation on discrimination, and recognising that the operation of Heathrow Airport was very much dependent on people from overseas, were aware that it could take considerable time to receive clearance and obtain an Airside ID Pass.

With the European Union, it was presumed that there was already an arrangement between the Police and Immigration Authorities, where they could obtain the required information from the Member States. There was obviously a considerable amount of liaison between the UK Authorities and the USA, given the latest Homeland Security rules of entering and existing the USA and the increasing amount of database controls that the UK Border Controls were introducing in this country.

The Technical Adviser suggested that the response from the Committee to the DfT should state that Option 4 was supported, with suitable safeguards attached to it.

4. Andy Hull referred to Paragraph 12 of Option 4. This stated that *'it was proposed that applicants would obtain the relevant overseas criminal history information and include it with their NSV application'*. He said that this could be open to corruption or bribery.

The Technical Adviser responded that it should also be noted that NSV clearance will not be granted until and unless overseas criminal record information (or the acceptable alternative) had been received and assessed by the DfT. It would therefore be hoped that they would be wise enough to detect fraudulent applications.

- 4247 NATS TERMINAL CONTROL NORTH (TCN) – FEBRUARY 2009 - UPDATE**  
Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC. 551**) and letter from NATS advising that they are to conduct a new consultation on revised proposals to redraw the aircraft route map in the areas of South-East England had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

1. Mr. Jon Proudlove stated that it was the intention of NATS to go back to consultation on the Terminal Control North later in the year. He had been advised by his colleagues that this would not be before July 2009. They had taken on board the feedback received as a result of the first round of consultation.

NATS will effectively be taking a series of proposals out to consultation into the communities for feedback as round two of the consultation. Some of that would impact upon the Heathrow routings, but it was more related to the routings in and out of Stansted and Luton Airports.

2. Margaret Majumdar asked if there would be a wider community consultation as, on the first round, very few of those who would be affected by the new routes had known about the consultation. It would be desirable to give priority to the Residents' Groups.

Mr. Proudlove replied that whilst he could not answer this immediately, he would take this query back to NATS and provide a written update once he had the information.

**ACTION:**

**JON**

**PROUDLOVE**

3. Mr. Proudlove stated that with regard to the Cranford Agreement, as a result of the Secretary of State's Announcement, he effectively gave NATS permission to use the Northern Runway for departures in an easterly direction. This had now been fed into the work packages that had been created as a result of the Announcement. There was a whole series of work driven around this on arrivals, departures, management of disruption and also looking at slot co-ordination and airline scheduling.

The easterly departures from the Northern Runway form part of the departures workstream and NATS needed to take further consideration now as to how an operation would be managed using easterly departures. A meeting had been held which had looked at the timescales involved around that. It was the expectation that there would be no immediate switch-on of easterly departures on the Northern Runway, because of the inherent complexities with regards to managing the integration of those departures into the departures currently on 09R.

There were also infrastructure issues. The taxiway infrastructure was not designed to support a 09L departure operation, nor were the exits off 09R designed to support an intensive arrival operation onto 09R. NATS had been working in partnership with BAA since the Announcement and would consider modelling and assimilation works to understand fully the implications of a 09L departure scenario.

It was emphasised that the work packages were being produced in close co-operation between NATS, BAA and also the airlines who had provided good support to the systems and contributions to the ongoing effect.

4. Cllr. Barrett asked if it was possible to receive an illustration or mapping of the proposed routings.

Mr. Proudlove replied that the routings were already in existence. There were departures routes off Runway 09L, but they had not been particularly exercised. The SIDS supplied by the DfT had been tabled.

5. Mrs. Majumdar pointed out that the problem was the fact that the use of the two runways with flights to the East merged somewhere over the North Circular Road. If operating from both runways at once, it was not possible for this to continue.

Mr. Proudlove responded that this was correct. It was this area that NATS had to understand as to what the benefit would be of having 09L departures. The immediate reaction would be that if departures were to be put onto 09L this would actually slow down the departure routes of 09R. It was for this reason that assimilation work had to be undertaken and in line with BAA's expectations to decide how best to take this forward.

**4248 DfT's AIRCRAFT NOISE MONITORING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ANMAC)**

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC. 547**) and Summary Note of the ANMAC meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Technical Adviser reported that the HACAN/Clearskies representative on the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group had raised certain points which he had asked to be brought to the attention of ANMAC. A request would be made to put these on the Agenda of the next ANMAC meeting.

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

**4249 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

**4250 NTK WORKING GROUP**

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Margaret Majumdar referred to Minute 8.7 and asked if it was correct to say that Carole Havercroft was now also responsible for dealing with noise complaints. If not, who would be the person in BAA to refer these to.

The Technical Adviser responded that a member of the BAA Noise Team had mistakenly told enquirers that Carole Havercroft dealt with noise complaints. However, this was quashed at the March NTKWG meeting.

There is in existence a BAA Noise Complaints Line. Richard Norman is the Chairman of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group and Head of the Noise & Air Quality team. Noise complaints were in his remit. It was agreed that noise complaints should not be sent directly to HACC, although it was obviously of interest.

For a complaint to be investigated and dealt with, it should be directed to:- [Noise\\_complaints@baa.com](mailto:Noise_complaints@baa.com) or Tel. No: 0800 344844. There was also a direct link on the BAA website.

If a Member of HACC wished to raise a particular complaint about noise, this could be sent to Carole Havercroft, who was also the Secretary of the NTKWG. She could then forward to Richard Norman, with a request to supply the information to convey back to the Committee.

3. The Technical Adviser referred to Minute 7.14 of the 20<sup>th</sup> January 2009 NTKWG Minutes, where reference was made to BAA consulting and implementing a Noise Action Plan in line with the European Noise Directive. Frank Evans (DfT) had advised at the March NTKWG meeting that DEFRA expected to publish their definitive Guidance towards the end of March 2009.

This would then give BAA the necessary background to prepare its Draft Noise Action Plan which would be sent to HACC for consultation in the Autumn.

4. Margaret Majumdar pointed out that DEFRA could not issue a definitive Guidance at the end of March 2009, when people were still permitted to respond to the Amendments until May 2009.

The Technical Adviser responded that DEFRA would need to quickly deal with the responses to those Amendments. HACC was not directly involved, but had been informed that 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2009 was the due date for the publication of the Guidance.

#### **4251 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT**

1. BAA Borough Noise Line Figures for Quarters 3 & 4 2008 and LB Richmond upon Thames Noise Line Figures for Quarter 4 (October-December 2008) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

#### **4252 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for January and February 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. The Technical Adviser referred to the Planning Application for the land adjacent to Jury's Inn Hotel, Envoy Avenue, Heathrow. This was already a substantial Hotel in size. It did seem that there was an increase in Hotel provision on the South side of the airport, particularly on what was airport land, when up until now all of the Hotel development had been on the North side of the airport

Simon Baugh responded that he understood the Arora International Hotel Group purchased a substantial amount of property around the airport from BAA last year. It was imagined that both Arora Applications listed on the current report, were as part of that planned provision.

#### **4253 NEWS RELEASES**

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

#### **4254 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Isobel Knox reported that the 'Best Team' Award for a Partnership Project in the London Transport Awards was won by the Heathrow Area Transport Forum (HATF) for opening Terminal 5 and the Public Transport Interchange. The Award was won against much competition from major projects around London. It was in collaboration between team partnerships of London Transport, and the HATF, formed between BAA, British Airways and certain local authorities. It was noted that 40% of journeys into Heathrow by staff and passengers were made by public transport.
2. Roger Wiltshire referred to a leaflet that he had received from his local MP, a Member of the Liberal Democrat Party relating to Heathrow. Attached to that was a Briefing Note which referred to the expansion at the airport, which boldly stated that the new runway would be longer than the existing runways.

For those involved locally, it was important to remember that the third runway would be much shorter.

2. The Technical Adviser stated that as Members would be aware, the Government had introduced the Infrastructure Planning Commission. They would deal with the major developments in the planning field in this country, which would include any significant expansion of airports, power stations and controversial projects, which had widespread implications.

A 'road map' had been published for implementation of the Infrastructure Planning Commission. This explained how they would appoint people to run it. A decision had already been made on the appointment of the Chairman. One of the functions alongside this, was to list the Statutory Consultees for a National Policy Statement on Aviation, which the Department for Transport had to prepare. A Consultation had been published on this with a closing date of 20<sup>th</sup> April 2009, although it was not addressed to the HACC. It would be helpful if the Committee could achieve Statutory Consultee status on this.

The Technical Adviser said that unless any Member objected, he proposed that he would write to seek this. Most of the organisations concerned were national, but none were listed from the aviation industry.

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

This would be of interest to all of those Members concerned about the expansion of the Airport for when BAA submits a Planning Application. The date on which this is put in would determine whether this went through the current planning process, where the LB Hillingdon was the Planning Authority or whether through the Infrastructure Planning Commission.

The Technical Adviser continued that associated with this, Susan Kramer MP for Richmond Upon Thames had put a Private Members' Bill up in Parliament, to require that express Parliamentary Approval for the building of new major airports and additional runways at existing major airports should be brought into Law. It was understood that there was no prospect of this being passed, although this was not guaranteed until it had been defeated or abandoned. It had been submitted with all Party backing, but at the time the article was written, it did not have Government support.

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

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

**THURSDAY 21<sup>st</sup> MAY 2009 (TBC)**