

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 28th January 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. James Randall (Deputy)	-	LB Ealing
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Josephine Barrett	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Felicity Barwood	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Ruth Cadbury	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Jim Maddan	-	LB Wandsworth
Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy)	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Christopher Turrell	-	Bracknell Forest BC
Cllr. Balvinder Bains	-	Slough BC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Jack Pinkerton (Deputy)	-	Spelthorne
Cllr. Dev Dhillon	-	South Bucks DC
Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos	-	Surrey County Council
Virginia Godfrey	-	HACAN Clearskies
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Gerry Ceaser (Deputy)	-	LAANC
John Gurney	-	TUC
Iain Hope	-	LCCI
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Colin Mitchell	-	Independent

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

Colin Matthews	-	Chief Executive
Mike Brown	-	Chief Operating Officer
Mike Forster	-	Group Strategy Director
Simon Baugh	-	Director of Airport Communications

PRESENTERS

John Parkinson	-	Head of Airports Policy Division – DfT
Martin Capstick	-	Head of Aviation Environment Division – DfT

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

1. Cllr. Mo Khursheed (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. John Oswell (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Phillip Bicknell (RB Windsor & Maidenhead), Cllr. David Rowlands (Bucks County Council), Cllr. Trevor Egleton (Bucks County Council), Cllr. Patrick Roberts (Runnymede BC), Cllr. Moreton Moore (Runnymede BC), Cllr. Martin Elengorn (LB Richmond on Thames), Lynette Braithwaite (AUC), Rob Gibson (LAANC), Susan Laurie (Independent), Frank Wingate (Future Heathrow), Murad Quereshi (London Assembly), Philip Carlisle (GTMC).

4220 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd December 2008 were agreed.

4221 MATTERS ARISING

(a) Minute 4215 – Technical Adviser to provide copy of response letter to the Committee Members sent to defra re: Noise Action Plans.

1. The Technical Adviser had sent a response letter to defra, but was unable to provide a copy due to IT problems.

(b) Minute 4216 – Technical Adviser to send response letter to the DfT re: Emerging Thinking of the Independent Panel on Airport Regulation.

1. The Technical Adviser had sent a response letter to the DfT, but was unable to provide a copy due to IT problems.

(b) HACC Seminar – Mike Brown to give brief on issue surrounding train fares on ‘Heathrow Connect’ service into the airport.

1. Mike Brown reported that the situation was moving forward. Mr. Brian Raven, Managing Director of Heathrow Connect and Heathrow Express and his team had been in discussion with Transport for London, with a view to working together, including the possible use of the Oyster card on Heathrow Connect services. Progress from further meetings would be communicated to the HACC.
2. Cllr. Horn asked if the use of the Oyster Card on the Heathrow Connect service would include the Freedom Pass.

Mike Brown replied that this was one of a number of proposals currently being looked at. To clarify, it was not definitely said that the use of the Oyster Card on the Heathrow Connect service was agreed. It was part of an ongoing discussion. Clearly, the use of the Freedom Card would form part of those discussions. Mr. Brown said that he would double-check that the Freedom Pass was included on the agenda for discussion at the forthcoming meeting with TfL.

ACTION:
MIKE
BROWN

(b) HACC Seminar – Mike Brown to confirm time limit on destruction of bio-metric data.

1. Mike Brown confirmed that the bio-metric data from Domestic passengers using Terminal 1 and Terminal 5 was over-ridden within 24 hours. It was used for no other purpose.

(b) HACC Seminar – Mike Brown to investigate question of free travel from Hatton Cross into the Terminals on London Underground.

1. Mike Brown confirmed that the fares policy for the London Underground was a statutory responsibility of the Mayor of London. He understood that there were no plans to change the policy at this time.

(b) Correspondence relating to Minute 4147 of 16th July 2008 meeting – CAP 725 Airspace Change Process had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

4222 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

1. A letter from Nita Easey had been circulated to the Members for information and was noted.

4223 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 Mike Forster (*enclosed*).

2. Mike Forster said that he wished to comment on two further aspects of the **Heathrow's third runway gets green light report.**

BAA had made a significant number of contacts with Residents Groups and Stakeholder Groups since the Announcement e.g. Residents' Associations, Members of the Local Focus Forum, Industry Groups and Business Groups.

Consideration was being given as to how they structured the way in which they communicated together over this period of time. The regularity of meetings would need to be reviewed and how BAA interfaced with Residents' Groups such as the Local Focus Forum. With the current structure, the meetings were not sufficiently frequent to be able to share the options and subsequently consult during the process.

BAA would also be contacting the five local Boroughs to determine how they might start discussions in this respect.

Another aspect, which was a very important part of the overall debate, was the Surface Access challenge. As Members would be aware, there was a new company created, High Speed 2, which had to bring proposals forward by the end of the year. It was expected to identify the appropriate location for interchange between Great Western, Crossrail, services to the airport and high speed rail links.

BAA saw this as a very significant piece of work, not just for the airport, but for West London. Again, it was necessary to ensure that the dynamics were properly installed.

As stated, it was a very wide ranging announcement, but the aspects of how BAA worked with their stakeholder groups and how they considered the broader issues, particularly around surface access, was seen as very significant.

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

3. The Chairman asked if there was any truth in the Press article re: the Competition Commission Report that BAA had to go to the European Courts regarding loss of property rights.

Mike Forster replied that it would be wrong to speculate as to the action that BAA would take once the final report had been read.

The final decision by the Competition Commission would be received late February/early March. BAA would then have two months to consider this.

4. Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos asked how much money was available in the various charity funds.

Mike Forster responded that the Charity of the Year for 2009 was Age Concern/ Help the Aged and would receive donations from staff. Last year, BAA raised £250k for the Marie Curie Cancer Appeal.

5. Iain Hope referred to the comprehensive study of consultations that were taking place. It was noted that a number of these were on a very close timescale and closed before the next scheduled HACC meeting. A request was made that a one-page summary be sent to the Members listing the current and future consultations, together with the timescales in order that they could respond.

ACTION:
MIKE
FORSTER

6. Virginia Godfrey said that given alternation would remain, how would this affect BAA's intention to lift the 480K cap.

Mike Forster responded that BAA were working though the announcement provided by Geoff Hoon MP. It was understood that following this announcement, that the options which included a lifting of the cap before the third runway, were 'lifted of the table' as they were rejected.

7. Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey stressed that LB Hounslow were entirely against all plans for a third runway or sixth terminal, and therefore had no interest on the consultations.

Mike Forster responded that whilst it might be the case that people agreed or disagreed on the principles, BAA believed it to be appropriate to share and consult on the options and proposals. The local residents had discussed this with a great deal of interest.

BAA would also like to make sure that whilst principles may not be agreed, there were benefits out of expansion which did get tabled, such as employment for people in the five surrounding Boroughs.

8. Cllr. Potts asked who was the fifth local Borough, as he could only identify four - LB Hillingdon, LB Hounslow, LB Richmond upon Thames, Spelthorne BC.

Simon Baugh responded that Slough BC was the fifth Borough, although BAA would be consulting widely.

9. Cllr. Beer protested that Slough should not be the fifth Borough to be included in the consultation process as RB Windsor & Maidenhead were much more involved than Slough. Every airline that flew in and out of Heathrow, travelled over Windsor & Maidenhead, not Slough.
10. Cllr. Beer asked if it was known when the Cranford Agreement would cease to operate.

The Chairman responded that this was a matter for the Secretary of State.

11. Cllr. Bains stressed that the area of Slough did get affected by aircraft.

4224 DECISION ON EXPANSION OF HEATHROW AIRPORT

1. The Secretary of State announced on 15th January 2009 that he had decided to authorise the construction of a third runway at Heathrow Airport together with various associated measures. The following documents had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
 - (a) Copy of Statement made to Parliament, Press Notice and ‘Adding Capacity at Heathrow – Decisions following Consultation’.
 - (b) Copy of Statement regarding the Decision by Colin Matthews, CEO of BAA plc together with BAA’s Background Brief.
2. Mr. John Parkinson, Head of Airports Policy Division and Mr. Martin Capstick Head of Aviation Environment Division at the Department for Transport presented ‘Adding Capacity at Heathrow Airport - Key Decisions’ (*enclosed*).
3. Following on from the presentation, Colin Matthews stated firstly, that it was recognised that the decision had not been a simple one. It had been difficult both because the issues were complicated and not binary, simple or straight-forward. They were complicated more so, because of the extent of controversy and strong feelings on it. Equally, it was a decision that needed to be taken and BAA were glad that the Government had stepped up to that need. Obviously, because BAA had been arguing that case, it was thought to be the right decision and would put Heathrow in the position to continue to provide this Country with a direct connection to the World, rather than to have Paris or Schipol serve as our main threat.

Secondly, it was known that the decision was particularly difficult for some people. Obviously, the position of BAA would continue, but it would be particularly difficult for the people directly affected in local communities. BAA understood this and were trying to find the best possible solution to minimise the damaging impact upon local communities as well as to maximise the positive impact that would come from the economic benefit.

In that context, where trust had been lost within those local communities, BAA intended to do their utmost to re-build that trust.

Thirdly, as the presentation from John Parkinson and Martin Capstick very clearly demonstrated, the announcement was complicated. It had many elements in it. It was not a straight-forward yes or no. It had many significant Conditions. Therefore, it was not instantly possible for BAA to answer as many questions as they would like. There was much work to do. There were very challenging environmental limits which had been defined. This meant that many people at HACC and those outside had very specific questions which they would like both him and his colleagues to answer at the meeting. However, this was not possible. There was a major challenge within as short as possible a timespan to develop from concept to a specific plan for people to grapple with. Therefore, BAA attendance at the HACC meeting on this occasion, was more to listen to the Members than to make statements.

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

1. Virginia Godfrey said firstly, that the decision to continue with runway alternation was a huge relief. Secondly, with regard to the timing of noise limits. It had been stated that the pre-condition for releasing new capacity was that air quality and noise were already met. Therefore, when would these new noise limits come into force. If it was a pre-condition that it was already met, did this mean that the noise limits would be operational before 2015.

John Parkinson replied that it meant that before new capacity could be added operationally, the noise limits would need to be met. There were judgements to be made on this. One of the factors that needed to be brought into account was the modelling work which the Department for Transport had undertaken. That work had been extensive, which was Peer Reviewed and regarded as extremely robust. The Secretary of State had used that work as part of the evidence in reaching his decisions. Therefore, the view of the DfT was that the noise limits will be met by 2015.

Clearly, they wanted to ensure that this was in fact the case, which was why the commitment had been made that if a third runway could be operational by 2015, the noise limits would have to be met before new flights could actually take off

Virginia Godfrey asked if this would be enforced in 2015.

John Parkinson replied that the intention was to have an ongoing monitoring mechanism. Both the CAA and the Environment Agency would be involved in that. for noise and air quality.. Both Regulators would have the necessary powers to enforce limits should they be breached.

2. Gerry Ceaser stated that with regard to transportation, it was known that improvements were needed on the Piccadilly Line, with Crossrail and the Great Western. One of the causes of concern to people in the area of Spelthorne, related to AirTrack. As a result of the decision on the third runway, was it correct to say that AirTrack would now be Government policy.

Mr. Parkinson replied that the decision document made it clear that the Government welcomed the approach that BAA had undertaken in terms of taking the AirTrack scheme forward.

The commitment was that the DfT would work with BAA and Network Rail to look at developing this scheme. Clearly, as with many schemes of this type, there were many issues that needed to be looked at, including how to integrate a new airport specific service with existing rail services to achieve the right balance.

3. Cllr. Potts said that the LB Ealing had raised the question to the response report, that if flights were to be allowed on the Northern Runway, flight paths had not been shown that would result. These had been requested by the LB Ealing but had not been received from the Department for Transport.

Martin Capstick responded that off the Northern Runway, there were planned departure routes. Clearly, if LB Ealing were not aware of these, a response would be sent from the DfT.

4. The Technical Adviser reminded the Committee Members that several months ago, they looked at a consultation from NATS on Traffic Control Zone North. This did show the paths for aircraft taking off from the Northern Runway and going up to join the path from the Southern Runway, which will run over Ealing. This route was not very different to that which occurs occasionally now.

Dr. Majumdar had raised several points on this at the time which were conveyed to NATS. Both NATS and the Civil Aviation Authority had recently reminded people that they (CAA) had still to look at the information from NATS to decide whether to confirm or not the proposals.

In response, John Parkinson agreed to provide a map of the SIDS for the Northern Runway departures on easterlies (09RL) to LB Ealing.

ACTION:
DfT

5. Margaret Majumdar stated that last Autumn before the announcement was made, a consultation document on Noise Action Plans for Airports to meet the EU Noise Limits was published. The noise limits referred not to 57 dBA Leq but to 55 decibels. In the South of Ealing this made a big difference. The DfT had always maintained that Ealing did not suffer air traffic noise, because year-round it did not receive 57 decibels. However, in bad weather it suffered more than 57 decibels, when aeroplanes were taking off to the East. Certainly 55 decibels were experienced year-round in the terms that the consultation document referred to for the EU Regulations.

Mrs. Majumdar asked how the DfT expected BAA to conform to the Regulations which the EU had set out.

Martin Capstick responded that the requirements under the EU Noise Directive were not the limits, but requirements to report. It was true that the reporting was using a different metric from the 57 dBA Leq metric which the Government had used for a long time, and continued to use as regards a measure for the noise limits at Heathrow.

Noise maps had been produced which included the EU figure. The consultation related to the requirement for airports to produce a Noise Action Plan. The consultation had now been completed. BAA would need to produce an Action Plan this year, which sets out the action they intend to take to mitigate noise.

The Action Plan did not require achievement of a level of noise.

When the Action Plan was produced the Committee would wish to consider whether it was adequate and the Members might have ideas as to how BAA may improve upon it.

Margaret Majumdar continued that this meant that the LB Ealing would continue to suffer the level of noise currently, because there was no intention of using a metric other than 57 dBA Leq.

Martin Capstick responded that the Government currently continued to use 57 dBA Leq and it had no plans to change this. The question as to whether there will be less noise was a different question from how it was measured. The forecasts showed that the noise levels reduce over time, and particularly, that by 2030, the noise levels in communities around Heathrow would be rather lower than at present.

6. Cllr Potts stated that the local authorities did not accept the 57 dBA average, because it was possible to experience a higher level than that, particularly when there was not continuous noise. It was the maximum level of noise which was the most dangerous to health.
7. Cllr. Maddan asked if the DfT wished to comment on the article that had been featured in 'The Times' on 28th January 2009 entitled 'Third Runway at Heathrow to bring expansion at all other Airports to a halt' and the impacts arising from that.

Part of the article had stated that 'the Minister has said that emissions from British Aviation would have to be reduced to below 2005 levels' (which he thought everybody accepted).

The article continued 'that on the same day, the Department for Transport quietly published its forecast for the growth of aviation carbon dioxide, particularly, where even assuming steady improvements in aircraft, emissions would rise to 59.9 million tonnes in 2050'.

Martin Capstick explained that this matter was a complicated issue. Firstly, the article was somebody's speculation about what aviation emissions might or might not be in 2050 and what action they thought the Government might or might not take in respect of airports.

As outlined, the Government had commissioned the Climate Change Committee to provide advice by the end of the year. It was much more helpful to take views on the way forward when proper evidence was available, rather than speculative views which somebody had produced and drawn their own conclusions from, which were not necessarily those shared by other people.

The report had stated that the only way to achieve the target was to cancel airport expansion. The industry report had stated that all the planned aircraft expansion would still comfortably meet the targets.

With regard to the question relating to forecasts. The DfT regularly produced and had produced at the same time as the Heathrow announcement, an update of their passenger demand forecasts and linked with that carbon dioxide forecasts.

The passenger demand forecasts which were published in 2009 were slightly lower than previous forecasts. This reflected the Recession upon us which would impact, and brought down the forecast passenger numbers for 2030 from 465 million to 455 million.

As part of that, in order to be open and transparent, if passenger forecasts are made with assumptions about technology gains, the emissions are calculated. The DfT assumed figures in fuel efficiency of 1.5% between 2009 -2020, 0.9% between 2020-2030 and 0.6% beyond 2030.

Using those cautious assumptions a forecast was produced, which as stated, led to emissions in 2050 of 59.9 million tonnes of carbon dioxide in parts of the UK.

The DfT had been working on these figures for some time. Clearly, the target for the UK aviation industry in 2050 which must be down below 2005 levels is not compatible with that. The implication of the target which the Government had announced, meant that emissions might be 59.9 million tonnes if there was no target. The forecasts showed the extent of the challenge. However, there were a number of ways in which it was possible to bridge the gap.

For example, the forecast that the Government produced which led to the 59.9 million tonnes of carbon dioxide, had made no assumptions about bio-fuels, because the DfT wanted to focus on what they knew. It was for this reason that the assumption on the rate of technology slowed down into the future, as if figures had been used which the DfT could not back up with some reasonable evidence, people would have said that they were being overly optimistic and that was not fallible. That said, bio-fuels was an area on which much work was being carried out, both nationally and internationally. Was it plausible that by 2015 there would no bio-fuels in relation to aviation. It was thought that this would an unlikely outcome. Therefore, to find out how best to achieve the announced target, meant looking at how to go beyond the improvements which had already been factored into the document and to ensure that the target was met.

The range of measures which might be needed to meet the target, could be more technology, bio-fuels, economic stability or stronger international trading mechanism, all of which could have a role to play.

The article in 'The Times' was disappointing because it had implied that the only way to achieve the target was to stop progress. The article was regarded as a piece of speculation, with one person arguing that their preferred solution was the only way to hit the target.

8. Roger Wiltshire said that he supported the comment made by Mr. Colin Matthews. BATA thought that it was important to engage with the local communities and gain their trust.

With regard to technology issues around expansion and the article in 'The Times', the industry, and not just the Government target, would have pressure on them in the next 10-20 years. Historically, the industry had delivered big improvements in fuel efficiency over the past forty years and could expect to achieve the same again over the next forty years.

As a point of interest, an article in the 'Metro' newspaper had stated that a brand new small Toyota car which had been promoted as a very efficient car, still did not achieve the full fuel efficiency. Therefore, the industry was well on the road to good efficiency, but did not stop making improvements.

9. Cllr. Horn said that the LB Hillingdon had built two By-Passes to relieve congestion on the North-South routes through the Borough.

At its last Cabinet meeting, the Council indicated to the Mayor of London that it would like his support for an extension of the Metropolitan Line from Uxbridge into Heathrow. A request was made to the Department for Transport to register this information. This was agreed.

10. Cllr.. Beer commented that much had been said that enforcements would be made to control the noise limits. As the limits were sometimes exceeded, how would the enforcement be applied. Would there be a mandatory limit or otherwise.

Martin Capstick responded that this was an area where work still needed to be done. The DfT contemplated a position where before deciding whether to allow an incremental increase in movements, the CAA would need to identify how many more movements they thought could be released, whilst staying within the air quality limit, consulting with people as necessary. They would then allow those movements to operate.

It was expected that this would ensure continued compliance. However, it was understood that people also wanted re-assurance, as to what would happen if there was a problem. If this was the case, the Environment Agency would have the powers necessary to bring air quality back into compliance with the limits.

That could include measures at the airport, as part of the package to deal with that. Certainly, the CAA would need to ensure that there was a mechanism in place, the detail of which would be worked out and people consulted with.

It would be necessary to understand how the mechanism worked and have confidence in it.

11. Mr. Capstick thanked the Committee for the opportunity to be able to address a knowledgeable audience with the DfT presentation in a systematic way.

The Chairman thanked both Mr. Capstick and Mr. Parkinson for their attendance at the HACC meeting.

11. The Technical Adviser referred to Air Quality. DEFRA (Department of Environment, Food & Rural Affairs) had launched a Consultation on UK Application to the European Commission for an extension of time to meet air quality limits for Particulate Matter (PM10). This did not refer to other gases which contribute to air pollution, including carbon dioxide or nitrogen oxide.

DEFRA were seeking views on the Consultation from different organisations.. These were to be submitted by 10th March 2009. As this closing date was before the next HACC meeting, the Chairman and Secretariat would form a response on behalf of the Committee.

ACTION:
CHAIRMAN/
SECRETARIAT

The Consultation stated that the extension would enable current plan measures to take effect to reduce current PM10 levels to within the European Union limits by the extended deadline of 2011. Most other Member States of the European Union had also reported breaches of the PM10 limits since they came into force in 2005 and they also need to apply to the European Commission for the additional time available under the new Ambient Air Quality Directive.

Although it was not a matter directly linked to the third runway, it would apply in most circumstances.

The Consultation stated that levels of PM10 had been falling across the UK. It was only in eight areas that breaches had occurred. One of those areas was the Greater London Urban area. This applied to the whole of Greater London and not only Heathrow.

4225 WAKE TURBULENCE FROM A.380 AIRCRAFT

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC. 544**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

4226 AIR QUALITY AT HEATHROW AIRPORT

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC. 545**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman advised the Committee that it was hoped in March or shortly thereafter, sufficient information would be available to invite Omega to present to the Committee the latest round-up of air quality matters.

4227 AIRPORT AIRSIDE PASSES – CRIMINAL RECORD CHECKS – FOREIGN NATIONALS

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC. 546**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

4228 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee meeting held on 3rd December 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4229 NTK WORKING GROUP

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

4230 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

1. BAA Heathrow Noise Complaints Report for Quarter 4 (October-December 2008) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

4231 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE

1. Report from Heathrow Flight Evaluation Team for the period of Winter 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Roger Wiltshire referred to the Airbus 380s flown by airlines into Heathrow He asked for data on where the aircraft sat in terms of slots, as the QC seemed significantly lower.

Mike Forster agreed that a summary of scheduled arrival and departure times of the four A380s currently operating from Heathrow would be provided. **ACTION:**

SIMON
BAUGH

3. Gerry Ceaser asked what the QC level was for the A380.

Roger Wiltshire replied that it was believed to be QC2 on departure and QC1 on arrival.

Simon Baugh undertook to provide the QC of A380s on arrival and departure compared to 747s.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

4232 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Planning Applications for the Heathrow Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon for November and December 2008 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. John Gurney referred to the application for Compound D, Terminal 5, Heathrow. He asked if this was for the erection of a new Hotel or an extension to an existing Hotel.

Mike Forster responded that he understood that this was an additional Hotel for airline crew. It would be situated between the Arora Hotel and the Roundabout.

4233 NEWS RELEASES

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

4234 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. The Technical Adviser reminded the Committee Members that they had previously received a report (**HACC 497**) dated 16th July 2007 regarding The Heathrow Bird Strike Working Group, which had met for two years to discuss proposals to reduce the number of Canada Geese, because of several incidents that had occurred at Heathrow Airport. The last incident had badly damaged a United Airlines 777 as it was about to touchdown on the ground. As a result of this, 40 Canada Geese were killed. This gave rise to a very lengthy Working Party looking at solutions.

BAA had undertaken much work on this, including pricking Canada Geese eggs in the permitted period, because Canada Geese are protected birds for most of the year. To prick their eggs in the hatching season was probably the most effective way to reduce their numbers, although it would take some years for a real effect. BAA held a number of discussions with local farmers, in order to control or change the crops that were grown so as not to attract the birds.

2. Cllr. Denise Saliagopoulos asked BAA how much money was available in the Noise Fines Fund to donate to charity.

Simon Baugh replied that at the last HACC meeting he had given a rundown of the allocation of monies from the Noise Fines Fund.

It was agreed that a summary of total monies given by BAA to charity; local communities; S106 Agreements and local business groups would be provided.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

3. The Technical Adviser said, that as regrettably there was insufficient time at the end of the HACC Seminar in December 2008 for him to be able to complete the presentation he had prepared about “Estuary Island Airports” following the Mayor of London’s views on the subject, he further supplemented copies of the illustrations with a short explanation.
4. Roger Wiltshire thanked the Technical Adviser for reminding the Committee on some of the issues surrounding Estuary Airports and for how long the debate had actually been ongoing.

The debate continued and to read the next instalment of the saga was awaited with interest. According to articles in ‘The Evening Standard’ and ‘The Sunday Times’ the airport would be put on two separate islands, positioned somewhere between Cliffe in Kent and the site identified on the Technical Adviser’s map, South of Southend.

In a novel way, the airport would be split over both banks of the Estuary. There would be a Terminal to the North and a Terminal to the South. Bizarrely, the North Terminal would be next to Southend.

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

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY 25th MARCH 2009

