

HEATHROW AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 29th July 2009 at Heathrow Point West

PRESENT:

Sam Jones, Chairman	-	HACC
Maurice Hudson, Technical Adviser	-	HACC
Carole Havercroft, Secretary	-	HACC
Cllr. John Oswell	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Graham Horn	-	LB Hillingdon
Cllr. Felicity Barwood	-	LB Hounslow
Cllr. Malcolm Beer (Deputy)	-	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr. Balvinder Bains	-	Slough BC
Cllr. George Trussler	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Denise Grant	-	Spelthorne BC
Cllr. Ian Lake	-	Surrey County Council
Murad Qureshi	-	London Assembly
Frank Wingate	-	Future Heathrow
John Stewart (Deputy)	-	HACAN/Clearskies
Philip Dann (Deputy)	-	AUC
Philip Carlisle	-	GTMC
Susan Parsons	-	ABTA
Roger Wiltshire	-	BATA
Isobel Knox (Deputy)	-	IATA
Margaret Majumdar	-	EANAG
Rob Gibson	-	LAANC
Brian Yates	-	Consumers' Association
Andy Hull	-	Independent
Keith Harlow	-	Independent
Susan Laurie	-	Independent

HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED

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

PRESENTERS

David Vowles	-	BAA Air Quality & Noise Policy Manager
(Tim Hardy	-	BAA Airside Director
(Jane Dawes	-	BAA Operational Noise Manager
Rick Norman	-	BAA Head of Noise & Air Quality

OTHERS

Frank Evans	-	Department for Transport
-------------	---	--------------------------

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from the following:-

Mike Forster (BAA R3 Director), John Gurney (TUC), Lynette Braithwaite (AUC), Colin Mitchell (Independent), Virginia Godfrey (HACAN/Clearskies), Iain Hope (LCCI), Cllr. David Simpson (London Councils), Cllr. Geoff Acton & Cllr. Martin Elengorn (LB Richmond upon Thames), Cllr. Christopher Turrell (Bracknell Forest BC), Cllr. Nicholas Botterill (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr. Santokh Dhillon (LB Hillingdon), Cllr. Peter De Vic Carey (LB Hounslow).

4274 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 11th June 2009 were agreed with the following amendment:-
2. **(Secretary's Note)** Rob Gibson had requested that point 6 of Minute 4260 should read:- 'Percentage of air transport movements with NOx emissions at least 20% better than CAEP/4 standards were reducing'.

4275 MATTERS ARISING

(a) Minute 4257 – Secretary to send letter of congratulations to Cllr. Mo Khursheed on his appointment as Leader of the Labour Group at LB Hillingdon.

1. The Secretary had actioned this.

(a) Minute 4260 – Mike Forster to arrange for copies of BAA Noise Action Plan to be sent to Members of the Committee.

1. This had been actioned.

(b) Minute 4268 – Mike Forster to arrange an update on the implications of the new Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) process for a future meeting.

1. This will be actioned.

(c) Minute 4260 – Mike Forster to establish if Passenger Movement Figures in BAA Corporate Responsibility Report were reduced.

1. This was covered under Minute 4278.

(d) Minute 4260 – Mike Forster to provide a list of consultees for the BAA Draft Noise Action Plan.

1. This was covered under Minute 4280.

(e) Minute 4262 – BAA to report on the first meeting of the Heathrow Delivery Project Board.

1. The DfT report of this meeting had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

(f) **Minute 4264 – Technical Adviser to speak at ANMAC on provision of Minutes.**

1. Since the June 2009 HACC meeting, there had been no further ANMAC meeting at which to raise this subject.

(g) **Minute 4264 – Mike Forster to arrange presentation on the scope of work involved – abolition of Cranford Agreement.**

1. This had been actioned. (See Minute 4279).

(h) **Minute 4248 – Technical Adviser to write to the DfT to seek Statutory Consultee status for the National Policy Statement on Aviation.**

1. This had been actioned.

4276 REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARIAT

- (a) The Chairman reported that the term of office for the current Independent Members of the HACC and Passenger Services Sub-Committee has been extended by the consent of BAA for a further three years.

BAA had advertised for volunteers to fill the remaining vacancies (*copy of the advertisement had been circulated with the Agenda and noted*).

Interviews had been conducted, but as yet no offer letters of appointment had been sent. It had been decided that there would be two new Members joining the Committee, the first in September 2009 with the second in December 2009. One person was an expert on air traffic management and the other had designed the interior of airports throughout the World.

- (b) Following the local Elections in May 2009, letters had been received from:- **London Borough of Ealing** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Ian Potts as the HACC Member and Cllr. James Randall as Deputy, **Runnymede Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Patrick Roberts as the HACC Member and Professor Moreton Moore as Deputy, **Slough Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Balvinder Bains as the HACC Member and Cllr. James Walsh as Deputy, **London Councils** confirming the appointment of Cllr. David Simpson as the HACC Member and the re-appointment of Cllr. Heidi Alexander as Deputy, **Spelthorne Borough Council** confirming the re-appointment of Cllr. Denise Grant and Cllr. George Trussler as the HACC Members and Cllr. Gerald Forsbrey and Cllr. Jack Pinkerton as Deputies, **LB Richmond upon Thames** confirming the appointment of Cllr. Geoff Acton as the HACC Member and the appointment of Cllr. Martin Elengorn as Deputy.
- (c) A letter had also been received from **BATA** to advise the appointment of Georgina Kwaszenko as Deputy to Roger Wiltshire.

4277 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*).

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

2. Philip Carlisle commented that as the Members would notice, the advertisement for new Independent Members of the HACC/PSSC quoted the fact that this Committee(s) was a prime forum for consultation by the Department for Transport (DfT), the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), Transport for London (TfL) and BAA.

Unfortunately, in the BAA submission to the DfT's Consultation on 'Reforming the Framework for the Economic Regulation of UK Airports' this fact was not registered.

A quote was read to the Members from the submission.

'BAA would like to press ahead to establish a local Passenger Group at Heathrow as soon as possible and then apply the learning to setting up similar Groups at other airports. It would also be important to review the appropriate future role of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee within the context of the discussion regarding the role of Passenger Focus or the AUC'.

Philip Carlisle said that as Chairman of the PSSC, his Members found this to be slightly insulting, as it was thought that this remit was already covered. If those Members were not carrying out the role well enough and more people were required to do this, it was acceptable. Going forward, the Committee would actually like to be even more productive in output of role as a 'critical friend' of the airport.

Therefore, it was proposed that if possible, BAA should make better use of the Committee as opposed to having a parallel group or operation.

Mike Brown responded that whilst he would not comment in detail on this matter, as he would need to discover the context in which this was specifically stated, he welcomed the remarks made about exploring how and what BAA might wish to continue to do, to involve the input of the work of the Committee on these issues.

3. Cllr. Beer referred to the MPs debate on Heathrow expansion plans. It had been noted that the three MPs who were in support had been named. Therefore, in fairness and proper unbiased attitude, those who spoke in favour of opposition should also be noted.

Mr. Brown responded that he apologised for the oversight. As people would recognise, there were many honourable MPs and others who had participated in this debate.

4. Murad Qureshi referred firstly to freight figures. He had noted that whilst passenger numbers and flights was decreasing, freight totals would appear to be increasing. Secondly, he asked what had been the operational impacts of Swine Flu. Thirdly, it had been brought to his attention by residents in North London that not all the aviation fuel being transported in to the depot was arriving by pipe, but rail, which did not make sense.

Mr. Brown responded that he would ensure that the specific figures would be provided for freight totals. In no way had there been an increase in freight, as a consequence of the impact of decreasing passenger numbers.

In relation to the Swine Flu Pandemic, it was true that BAA had contingency plans in place with all of the other agencies operating at Heathrow, the airlines and other members of the community at the airport.

BAA had continued to follow the guidance of the Department for Transport. The advice to the public remained the same; good personal hygiene was essential with hand washing and disposal of used tissues. Members of the Committee may have noticed that BAA had installed waste bins in the Landside areas within all Terminals around the airport, to ensure that there were adequate facilities to dispose of such items. BAA were also checking that the cleaning was up to standard.

The airlines continued the standard practice of reporting passengers who may be suspected of an ailment.

BAA were certainly not complacent on this matter and continued to follow best practice from its advisors and Government whilst monitoring the situation.

Simon Baugh responded to the query on the piping of aviation fuel. BAA did try to operate a number of sources. It would be remembered that when the Buncefield oil disaster occurred in 2005, it caused significant problems, as that one particular incident dramatically curtailed the supply to the airport and airlines were required to fuel as much as they could overseas, particularly on short-haul flights. Therefore, arrangements were now in place to ensure there was a back-up supply.

Murad Qureshi reiterated that aviation fuel still arrived into North London by freight train, although it was a number of years since the Buncefield disaster. He asked that BAA look into this matter and provide figures for freight totals.

Simon Baugh agreed to undertake this action.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

5. Murad Qureshi advised that in November 2009, the London Assembly Environment Committee would be looking at the Regulatory Controls of Future Expansion at Heathrow.
6. The Technical Adviser referred to the MPs' report and the comments made about aircraft 'stacking'. He thought that the point had not been understood that 'stacking' did not occur in the vicinity of Heathrow, but twenty miles away, at each of four beacons that were used for the purpose of guiding aircraft in. If Heathrow were not able to accept the aircraft immediately, they were 'stacked' and generally flew around a 'race-track circuit', which might be approximately seven miles long. To say that aircraft stacked and caused a problem in the close vicinity of Heathrow was incorrect.

4278 AIR QUALITY AT HEATHROW

1. Presentation by David Vowles, Air Quality & Noise Policy Manager on the Air Quality at Heathrow (*enclosed*). Briefing Note on Air Quality at Heathrow in April 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

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

2. The Chairman said he understood that in future, a Quarterly Air Quality Monitoring Report would be provided to the Committee.

David Vowles confirmed that this was correct.

3. Rob Gibson commented that he thought that if differential landing charges were used, more aircraft should be included, so that they were part of the Action Plan.

David Vowles responded that the differential landing charge, to the airlines was quite a small part of their landing charge. It was not something BAA could waive and it would not be a fair measure of what the airlines were doing, to include more aircraft.

Rob Gibson asked for clarification on this point. He asked if it was correct that a metric had been picked which encouraged a reduction in emissions. Yet, because it did not work as expected, instead of trying to make the landing charge work, the metric would be changed.

David Vowles responded that it was not thought that the metric worked as it is.

4. Simon Baugh commented that both the landing charge, metrics and emissions needed to be looked at.

Rob Gibson stated that he wished his disagreement in the way that this system was applied to be registered.

5. Rob Gibson referred to the 2008-2009 monitoring sites. The assertion had been made, that in 2015 the area of Heathrow would be free of exceedence based on the DfT modelling. The level had to be achieved next year (2010). The Government were applying for a time extension. This was by no means guaranteed. It could be seen by the way that the EU had looked at other time extensions, 70% of which were rejected by the EU.

Some of the drops in concentration between now and 2015 were highly significant. If reductions in emissions and concentration were looked at, they did not match.

Rob Gibson said that he had issues with the way the modelling had been done. He thought that bearing in mind the input and output were inconsistent, to say with any confidence that in 2015 the Heathrow area would be free of exceedence, was highly unwise.

6. Cllr. Horn asked how could the differential be shown that the ground monitoring stations were a rich source of information.

David Vowles replied that this source of information was used, together with others, which included weather conditions to build up the picture.

7. Murad Qureshi stated that a strong analysis had been given, but no action was seen. After Central London, Heathrow was an important area for air pollution. All the modelling shown indicated that the exceedence would not be reached until 2015.

David Vowles responded that the emission inventory would be the most recent they could produce. In order to meet the exceedence, improvements needed to be made from aircraft, airside and road vehicles.

8. Murad Qureshi requested that a PM10 Analysis be provided to him before the next HACC meeting in September. This was agreed. **ACTION:**
DAVID
VOWLES
9. The Chairman asked if a copy of the BAA Heathrow Local Air Quality Action Plan 2007-2011 could be provided to the Secretary. This was agreed - (*enclosed*). **ACTION:**
DAVID
VOWLES
10. Cllr. Beer asked if there was a Technical Audit on the much referred to modelling. It was of concern to note that the information that was being worked upon was seven years out of date. It was presumed that this was being used for all of the 'ball parks' in the future. It seemed to be amateurish to be carrying out modelling in this way on behalf of the whole community, by guesswork. Some people might feel it is biased.

David Vowles responded that the consultants used the best methods at their disposal to produce the modelling at the time. The dispersion modelling was not guesswork.

11. The Chairman thanked David Vowles for his presentation.

4279 ABOLITION OF THE CRANFORD AGREEMENT

1. Presentation by Tim Hardy, BAA Airside Director on the abolition of the Cranford Agreement, as announced by the Secretary of State in January 2009, and what this will mean for the affected residents surrounding Heathrow and the scope of work involved (*enclosed*).

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

2. John Stewart stated that a full infrastructure would need to be in place to implement this. He asked if it was going to be a gradual process or if it would all happen at once.

Tim Hardy responded that it would be at least 18 months before the infrastructure was developed into place. The process could not be started quickly. There was much work to be done. People would be advised well in advance.

3. John Stewart asked if there would be changes to the flight paths, with more flights than at present on certain paths.

Tim Hardy confirmed that there would be more flights on some paths and less on others. There would be alleviation on the Southern Runway with more use of the Northern Runway.

4. Margaret Majumdar believed that Mr. Hardy failed to mention the effect this would have on the residents. The areas of Ealing, Hounslow, Hanwell and Southall would be greatly disadvantaged. As far as she knew, there were no discussions that had taken place with Ealing Council, nor had there been information provided to the residents on this proposal.

In relation to the prospect of 'mixed-mode' this was horrendous. The take-off routes on the Northern and Southern Runways were fairly close together. The late-evening period was already very crowded, with the heavy long-distance aircraft, particularly when on easterlies. There would be flights directly overhead and some a mile or so to the North.

The Committee had previously been told that 'mixed-mode' would not be introduced. However, the description indicated that at certain times of the day, this would be used.

The flight paths from the Northern Runway met on the borders of Ealing and Brent and flew over the North Circular Road. If that continued, this would mean that the concentration of flights over the North-East would be increased. Nobody seemed to be acknowledging this fact.

Mr. Hardy responded that 'mixed-mode' was envisaged in the original consultation document. Whilst it was agreed that there could be departures on both runways at certain periods of the day, with arrivals on one runway, but not both runways at night-time, this was not 'mixed-mode'.

Before the proposal was implemented, the HACC would be informed of the arrangements.

5. The Chairman asked if Frank Evans representing the DfT could comment on the proposal.

Mr. Evans commented that there was a consultation on the Cranford Agreement. The Secretary of State took the response comments on board before making his decision. In terms of the future effects, a review of the noise monitoring sites would be carried out before a final decision was made.

6. Philip Carlisle asked if it was correct to assume the number of aircraft movements would not change.

Tim Hardy responded that there would not be a nett increase in the number of aircraft movements.

7. John Stewart asked if it was correct that at particular times of the day, one runway might be used for 'mixed-mode', but not all day.

Mr. Hardy responded that this was correct.

8. Mr. Stewart asked what percentage of time on a typical day would TEAM (Tactically Enhanced Arrivals Mode) be used.

Jane Dawes responded that it was not expected that TEAM would be operated beyond the current usage (approximately 4%).

Mr. Hardy said that the percentage would be low. TEAM (Tactically Enhanced Arrivals Mode) and TED (Tactically Enhanced Departures) would not be used at the same time.

9. Rob Gibson asked at what point would BAA visit the local authorities and schools to discuss this proposal.

Tim Hardy replied that the Local Focus Forum had been notified of the proposed Abolition of the Cranford Agreement to advise them of events.

Simon Baugh added that a BAA Director of Community had been appointed to go out and hold discussions with people.

Rob Gibson continued that he did not recollect that Directors of Education and Leaders of the Local Authorities were members of the Local Focus Forum. Certainly, the schools wished to be involved in this proposal to look at the implications. The current 16-hour contours would not be good enough.

10. Cllr. Barwood stated that the LB Hounslow had not been consulted on this proposal. She thought that schools and local residents should be issued with a robust consultation.
11. Simon Baugh pointed out that the question of whether the Cranford Agreement should remain or be abolished was part of the previously published main Third Runway DfT consultation.
12. Cllr. Beer remarked that his community in general believed that TEAM was used more than acknowledged. If the Cranford Agreement was abolished, the area of Windsor would suffer more aircraft noise. The disbenefits of Heathrow should be shared by local communities and a 'dog in a manger' attitude should not be taken by residents. However, many people would benefit from the proposal; including some residents in Hounslow.
13. Margaret Majumdar stated that she was puzzled by the idea that when TED was introduced, there would be a slow-down in arrivals. There was no slow-down in arrivals in the evening. There was a constant flow of flights until 11.30 p.m. and beyond. It was a different situation to the morning when there were relatively few departures.

Clarification was also asked for on the time-period of 18 months. It was not understood if it was 18 months before the use of TED was introduced, or if it was 18 months before the proposal could be fully implemented.

Mr. Hardy responded that once the necessary work had been completed with the Safety Regulator, the use of the Northern Runway tactically could be 6-9 months.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Hardy for his informative presentation.

4280 DRAFT BAA NOISE ACTION PLAN

1. Report by the Technical Adviser (**HACC.561**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted. Rick Norman, BAA Head of Noise & Air Quality on the BAA Noise Action Plan attended the meeting to advise the Committee and to answer questions. BAA is required under EU law to publish a Noise Action Plan to show their commitment and how it intends to manage the effects of aircraft noise from Heathrow's operations over the five years 2010-2015. (*Presentation enclosed*).

Rick Norman said that 58 responses to the Heathrow consultation had been received from individuals, which was more than other airports. There was still much work to be completed post-consultation, to take account of the responses, amend and adjust the Draft Noise Action Plan where necessary.

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

2. The Chairman referred to the key consultation questions on page 40 of the document. As the consultation did not end until October 2009, it was the intention to compile a report for the September meeting, which would pick up comments that the Members had submitted to the Secretariat and to discuss the consultation further.
3. John Stewart referred to the glidescope which was welcomed. He asked if an Independent Study would be commissioned on that. He said that he was pleased to see that the Lden 57 contour had been withdrawn. The 55 Lden contour showed that over 700,000 people were affected by aircraft noise, compared with less than 300,000 people with Leq. Therefore, could it be assumed that it was the end of the complication of Leq contours.

Mr. Stewart also referred to Night Flights. It had occurred to him that the current Night Flight regime would end in 2012. That was a considerable time away from 2015. It was thought that the Draft Noise Action Plan would contain a policy to address this, otherwise it would be three years where Night Flights would be, to some extent, in 'no man's land' and would certainly not be part of the efforts of BAA to reduce noise at Heathrow.

It was understood that the UK was alone amongst European countries in asking the airports to be the competent authorities for drawing up the Draft Noise Action Plans. It was a difficult task, which it was believed the Government should have undertaken. Had BAA thought of refusing this requirement.

Rick Norman responded to the questions. Firstly, it was envisaged that the glidescope would be managed through Sustainable Aviation. Secondly, the demise of the 57 Leq contour. This metric would continue to be operated as it was widely used internationally. A suite of metrics would be found to include Lden and Leq and others.

Mr. Evans commented that the whole issue of metrics had been debated for a number of years. The Omega Partnership had undertaken work to understand metrics. Over the next year, further work would be conducted on this subject, as it was a large issue for the DfT.

Rick Norman referred to the issue of Night Flights. People had commented in the responses that there should be some form of statement on the position of BAA on Night Flights in the Draft Noise Action Plan, but this would be captured elsewhere.

As regards to turning down the requirement to complete a Draft Noise Action Plan, BAA accepted the responsibility as the competent authority and did not refuse.

4. Frank Evans referred to Night Flights. It was the expectation that next year, there would be a consultation. The current regime did encourage the reduction of Night Flights. With regard to who should hold the responsibility of competent authority, it could well be that a number of the actions that come out of the Draft Noise Action Plan would fall to the DfT and not BAA.

The Chairman thanked Rick Norman for the presentation.

5. The Technical Adviser asked that if the Members had comments they wished to be included in the response to the Draft Noise Action Plan on behalf of the Committee, to please forward these to the Secretariat. As yet, individual views of the Members on the proposal which would be of assistance in drawing up a reply had not been provided.

ACTION:
ALL
MEMBERS

4281 HEATHROW CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2009

1. Report by the Technical Adviser and Attachment (**HACC.564**) had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. The Chairman said that this would be the subject of a presentation at a future meeting.
3. The Technical Adviser commented that there were several matters included in the report with large sums of money involved, which would have very considerable impacts upon the activity and infrastructure of the airport, with implications for the interests of the Committee, particularly the Passenger Services Sub-Committee.
4. Murad Qureshi referred to the Capital Investment Programme 2009 relevant to the Heathrow Connect train service. He asked if it was proposed that this would be extended to travel into Terminal 5.

Simon Baugh replied that it was not proposed to extend the service into Terminal 5. There was a limit at the number of trains that could go into Terminal 5. The Heathrow Express travelled into Terminal 4 and not Terminal 5, with the Heathrow Connect service travelling into Terminal 5 and not Terminal 4.

Murad Qureshi asked if it was the intention for AirTrack to be routed into Terminal 5.

Simon Baugh replied that it was the intention, but this would be to a separate platform.

5. Margaret Majumdar referred to page 410-412 of the Capital Investment Programme 2009. This related to the overlaying of the runways, which would extend their life by ten years. What did this mean.

The Technical Adviser responded that the overlaying of the runways was always of concern to the Committees, due to the impact, as it had to be carried out at night with a certain increase in disturbance to residents. As yet, there was no date set or a cost in the Budget.

6. Cllr. Beer commented that there did not appear to be a commitment to the provision of extra taxiways in the Capital Investment Plan.

The Technical Adviser responded that he had also not been able to locate evidence in The document, which to him conveyed coverage of that particular operation.

Simon Baugh stated that the Members were viewing only the Summary document The full Capital Investment Programme, which ran to several hundred pages long was available on the BAA website.

There was both provision and commitment within the Capital Investment Programme for taxiway improvements which formed part of Project for the Sustainable Development of Heathrow, which was a separate document.

Simon Baugh would confirm in which document taxiways were referred to.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

7. Murad Qureshi referred to the Heathrow Express service. The biggest issue on this was the cost of the fares. If they were cheaper, more people would travel on the service.

Simon Baugh responded that the Heathrow Express and Heathrow Connect service had appointed a new Managing Director, Mr. Richard Robinson. It was suggested that he attend the September meeting to present to the Members for introduction and to discuss the structure of fares. This was agreed.

ACTION:
SIMON
BAUGH

4282 PASSENGER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Passenger Services Sub-Committee held on 11th June 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4283 NTK WORKING GROUP

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Noise & Track Keeping Working Group held on 19th May 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.

4284 ANNUAL MEETING OF CHAIRMEN OF AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

1. Official Minutes of the meeting held in Belfast on 27th/28th May 2009 (**HACC.563**) had been circulated with the Agenda and were noted.
2. Margaret Majumdar referred to paragraph 27 on page 5, which referred to the discussion held on the structure, membership and purpose of Airport Consultative Committees. She asked if the HACC Members would be required to discuss this subject at some point. Earlier this year, when the DfT consultation document entitled 'Reforming the Framework for the Economic Regulation of UK Airports' was published, reference was made to a possible review of the structure of the Committee.

Frank Evans responded that in terms of the Airport Consultative Committees, one of the issues which had emerged over the last year was their role, which might need revision. The DfT were reporting on this issue and would put forward proposals. All the Airport Consultative Committees would be consulted prior to any changes which might be made.

Margaret Majumdar commented that it was hoped that the DfT would not choose to reduce the representation of residents around the airport.

The Technical Adviser responded that this suggestion would be most unlikely. There was a High Court case several years ago, where the local Residents' Associations near Fairoaks Aerodrome in Surrey, took the Aerodrome Operators to the High Court to get a decision as to why and whether it was legal to bar them as representatives on the Airport Consultative Committee. The decision of the learned Judge in that case, meant that the Fairoaks Aerodrome had to revise the procedures that they had adopted. However, that Committee was much smaller than the HACC.

At the time, he had referred the Judgement to BAA's Head of Legal Services. BAA had responded that they were satisfied with the working of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee and because it was so large with over 40 Members, it would be impracticable to take the same line as the Fairoaks Airport management.

Representatives from the Civil Aviation Authority had attended the PSSC meeting on the morning of 29th July 2009, to discuss enhancing the role of passenger and residents' representation at airports.

There was an ongoing debate on this matter. Eventually, if there were to be changes, these proposals would be put forward to the Committee. In the meantime, it would be hoped, that the Members had received in the past, a copy of the 'Guidelines for Airport Consultative Committees' which the DfT had published several years ago. This covered the role and the way in which Airport Consultative Committees should be set up and operated, and the HACC Secretariat did its best to ensure that these were followed, where practicable.

4285 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

4286 AIRCRAFT NOISE COMPLAINTS REPORT

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

4287 NIGHT QUOTA USAGE

1. Report from Heathrow Flight Evaluation Team for the period of Mid-Season Summer 2009 had been circulated with the Agenda and was noted.
2. Margaret Majumdar referred to Column 25 of the spreadsheet which indicated that there had been sixty departures after 11.30 p.m. It would seem that when there was an extraordinarily large number of Night Flights such as this, the report might contain some text to explain why this had occurred.

Margaret Majumdar continued that during week commencing 16th July 2009, there had been eight flights after 11.30 p.m. In the past, it was the usual practice of Nita Easey (former BAA Noise Advisor) to explain the reasons for this.

Mr. Norman had said that questions/comments could be sent to him requesting an explanation. Accordingly, an e-mail was sent to him on 17th July 2009 asking what the flights were and the airlines concerned, where they were travelling to and why they were delayed and if they could count against the Quota.

Mrs. Majumdar said that a reply was received from Mr. Norman which had stated that he would ask the BAA Flight Evaluation Unit to respond to the queries. One week later, a letter was received containing the 'surprising information' that her property was under a Noise Preference Route (NPR) and that there were Night Flights with no response given to the direct questions asked.

A second e-mail was sent to Rick Norman stating that previously, Nita Easey would have provided the information long before this time lapse, with a further request for the questions to be answered. As yet, unfortunately Rick had not had the opportunity to answer the questions properly himself, or to advise to whom the queries should be addressed.

Mrs. Majumdar stated that it was not satisfactory that the Members could not be provided with information, when such an occurrence has taken place.

Rick Norman responded that it was agreed where extremes are seen on the Night Quota Usage Report, there should be explanatory commentary. The Noise & Track Keeping Working Group were addressing this matter.

It was anticipated that the information Mrs. Majumdar had requested from the Flight Evaluation Team would be sent to her shortly.

If queries arose in the future, these could be sent directly to either himself or Jane Dawes. richard_norman@baa.com jane_dawes@baa.com

4288 NEWS RELEASES

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

4289 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. There were no further items to discuss and the Chairman closed the meeting at 4.28 p.m.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY 23rd SEPTEMBER 2009

