

UK AVIATION UPDATE

What this paper is about

To provide, for the information of Conference, a round-up of current UK activity in the field of aviation *not* covered by reports which appear elsewhere on the Agenda for this meeting including:

- White Paper *Future of Air Transport* – adding capacity at Heathrow – paras 1/6
- Improving the passenger experience - CAA Study – paras 7/9
- Price Controls at BAA's London Airports and Manchester – paras 10/14
- BAA Market Investigation – paras 15/22
- Review of PSZs – paras 23/25
- Planning Act 2008 – paras 26/30
- Planning Applications – Notification and Consultation – para 31/35
- Airspace Change Proposals – London's Terminal Control North – paras 36/38
- Air Passenger Duty – paras 39/41
- Wind farms – Effect on Radar – paras 42/46
- Aircraft Noise Monitoring Advisory Committee (ANMAC) – paras 47/50
- Attitudes to Noise from Aircraft Sources in England (ANASE) – paras 51/55
- Civil Aviation Act 2006 – paras 56/58
- Sustainable Aviation – Report on Emissions – paras 59/63
- Omega - paras 64/67
- Access to Air Travel for Disabled People – paras 68/70
- Charges for Airport Services – paras 71/77
- Swine Flu - para 78

Points for Discussion

- *Para - 26:* Members may like to talk about the possible blighting of homes and other property where PSZs are enlarged as a result of a review of a PSZ .
- *Para - 31:* The meeting may like to discuss whether there are any points which need to be made in relation to the proposed procedures for pre-application consultation on “nationally significant infrastructure projects”, and information an application submitted to the Infrastructure *Planning Commission* (IPC) should contain.
- *Para - 41:* Members may like to comment on the impact which the new system for Air Passenger Duty might have on the viability of smaller airports.
- *Para - 70:* The meeting might like to discuss any problems which might have arisen in introducing the new arrangements for assisting PRMs and to share experience and possible solutions. The problem of pre-notification seems to be a particular difficulty.
- *Para – 68-77:* The meeting might like to discuss the implications of the growing practice among Airports to charge for services which were previously free of charge or to make a charge for an “enhanced” service.

Points for Possible Action

The meeting will wish to decide whether to submit any representations in respect of the various points listed above for discussion by the meeting:

Note: Most of the regulations, directives, consultation papers and reports referred to in this report can be readily accessed from the Wider UK Issues page of the Liaison Group's website at <http://www.ukaccs.info/issues.htm>. The Secretariat is happy to provide electronic or hard copies of any of these documents if required. The web page is regularly updated and is a ready source of current information on UK initiatives in aviation.

White Paper *Future of Air Transport* – adding capacity at Heathrow

1. The 2003 White Paper *The Future of Air Transport* made clear that given the economic benefits to the UK, the Government supported the further development of Heathrow by adding a third runway and exploring the scope for making greater use of the existing runways. But this was subject to meeting strict local conditions on air quality and noise and improving public transport access:
 - There should be no net increase in the total area of the 57dBA noise contour. This would be measured at 127sq.km which was the size of the contour in the summer of 2002.
 - Government would need to be confident that levels of nitrogen dioxide (the critical pollutant) would be contained within EU limits, which will apply from 2010 or 2015 where the European Commission agrees the case for extension.
 - There must be improvements to public transport access to the airport.
 - The White Paper promised further work and consultation on a number of issues relating to Heathrow Airport. In the light of that work, the Department in November 2007 launched a consultation on how Heathrow could be developed over the next 20 years or more.
2. The consultation came to an end on 27 February 2008. It was one of the largest consultation exercises ever run by the Department of Transport with summary documents sent to 217,000 households around the airport and 13 exhibitions visited by more than 5000 people. The proposals stirred up considerable controversy which is still being felt.
3. The Government's decision¹ was announced in January 2009. In summary the announcement confirmed support for a third runway and associated passenger terminal facilities, while rejecting the case for mixed mode. Westerly preference would be retained, but the Cranford agreement (which generally prohibits easterly departures off the northern runway) would be ended. Night time rotation and early morning runway alternation were both confirmed.
4. Allowing 'mixed mode' to go ahead on the two existing runways would have seen them used simultaneously for both arrivals and take-offs. This would have ended the current system of runway alternation which gives local residents respite from overhead aircraft noise for at least 8 hours each day. Ending the Cranford agreement will spread noise more fairly around affected communities and extend the benefits of runway alternation to the residents of Windsor and others to the west of the airport, and Hatton and North Feltham to the east.
5. On 7 April 2009 a number of environmental groups, together with six local authorities (Hammersmith and Fulham, Hounslow, Hillingdon, Kensington and Chelsea, Richmond upon Thames, Wandsworth and Windsor and Maidenhead) and residents groups, launched a legal challenge against the government's decision claiming there was a failure to conduct a lawful consultation, that the decision was irrational and/or disproportionate and there was a failure to provide an adequately reasoned decision.
6. Those challenging the decision say that if the challenge is successful, the decision would be quashed and the Government would have to re-run the consultation. If the Court agrees that the decision was irrational then the Government may also be forced review its entire aviation policy, which supports expanding over thirty airports across the country.

Improving the passenger experience - CAA Study

7. In November 2007, the Secretary of State for Transport commissioned advice from CAA on improving the through-airport passenger experience. Concern was expressed about particular pinch points where there is potential for delay and where the responsibility for delivering a good service lies with a combination of bodies.

¹ <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/aviation/heathrowconsultations/heathrowdecision/>

8. As part of its work the CAA sent a representative to talk to UKACCs members at the last Annual Meeting at Heathrow and it also commissioned a passenger survey. The CAA's report of the Study can be accessed via the DfT's website². Paper 1 sets out the results of the Survey while in Paper 2 the CAA gives its advice on improving the through airport journey. The Executive Summary of Paper 2 is reproduced at Annex A to this paper.
9. There is more about this Study in the paper to be considered at this meeting commenting on the Government's plans to reform the framework for the economic regulation of UK airports.

Price Controls at BAA's London Airports and Manchester

10. Under the Airports Act 1986, the CAA is charged with setting price controls every five years at the BAA's London Airports (Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted) as well as at Manchester.
11. At the annual meeting last year members heard that:
 - After a long three year review the CAA on 11 March 2008 had published its decisions³ for price controls for Heathrow and Gatwick airports for the five years ending on 31 March 2013.
 - Manchester was to be de-designated so that at the end of the present (extended) price review period in April 2009 the Airport would be able to set its own charges.
 - The Government had announced that Stansted would continue to have the maximum level of its charges set by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). The Government believed that this remained the best way of protecting passengers who use the airport
12. The meeting noted also that the pre-April 2008 price controls applicable at Stansted Airport had been extended for a further year until April 2009 to allow more time for the CAA to complete its review of the charges there. In this connection the meeting heard that the CAA had already issued a consultation paper on the options and that on 29 April 2008 it had made a formal, mandatory reference to the Competition Commission (CC) and set out a number of options for the price control design. The same day the CC invited evidence from interested parties to be submitted by 13 May.
13. On 4 November 2008 the CC's report and recommendations were made public and on 9 December 2008 the CAA published its proposals for price controls at Stansted for the period 2009-14.
14. The CAA published its decisions⁴ on 13 March 2009 - a note of the key points is at Annex B to this paper. The Airport's owner, the BAA, commented that it recognised the cost pressures facing the entire industry today, and that it had agreed realistic capital spending plans with airlines over the coming five years. Looking to the long-term, the BAA felt the regulator should not discourage future important investment which it accepts is necessary and they were disappointed that a large element of the full cost of developing new capacity has been retrospectively disallowed.

BAA Market Investigation

15. At the Annual Meeting last year at Heathrow members heard that under the Enterprise Act 2002 the Office for Fair Trading (OFT) can make a market investigation reference to the Competition Commission (CC) if it has reasonable grounds for suspecting that competition is not working effectively in that market. Using these powers the OFT had referred to the CC for further investigation the supply of airport services by the BAA in the UK. BAA, part of the Spanish infrastructure Grupo Ferrovial, owns Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted and Southampton in South East England, and Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen in Scotland. These airports have an annual turnover of £2 billion and handle over 60 per cent of all air passengers in the UK.

² <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/aviation/hci/airpassengerexperience/>

³ http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/5/ergdocs/heathrowgatwickdecision_mar08.pdf

⁴ <http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/5/ergdocs/20090313StanstedPriceControl.pdf>

16. Following an initial period of information gathering, including visits to airports and holding hearings with interested parties, the CC in August 2007 published an *Issues Statement*. Later, on 22 April 2008, the the Commission published a report on its 'emerging thinking'.
17. At the Heathrow meeting members noted the concerns expressed by the *Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee* in relation to the CC's criticisms on a number of issues in this 'emerging thinking' report. The CC believed BAA's approach to developing its airports may well have prevented, restricted or distorted competition and the BAA was in effect criticised for not taking steps to override the Section 52 Agreement which had prevented the construction of a second runway at Gatwick Airport. The Liaison Group believed that local agreements were essential in providing local communities around airports with certainty about future growth plans and how the impacts would be managed. It was agreed to support the view that local agreements should be upheld in managing airport growth responsibly and the Secretariat was asked write to the CC accordingly.
18. On 20 August 2008 the CC published its "provisional findings" These were that there are competition problems at each of BAA's seven UK airports with adverse consequences for passengers and airlines. A principal cause is their common ownership by BAA. There are also competition problems arising from the planning system, aspects of Government policy and the system of regulation. The CC also published its proposed remedies for consultation. If these were to be implemented, the CC would order the BAA to sell two of its three London airports, and also either Edinburgh or Glasgow airport.
19. On 17 December 2008 the CC confirmed that, subject to final consultation, it would require BAA to sell both Gatwick and Stansted airports as well as Edinburgh airport⁵. It also proposed to introduce measures to ensure that investment and levels of service at Heathrow, and possibly Gatwick and Stansted, meet more effectively the needs of airlines, passengers and other airport users. At Aberdeen airport, it proposed measures to promote investment linked to rebates on charges but in response to local pressure the CC in February proposed remedies thought to be more appropriate. The CC said also it intended to make recommendations to the Government on a more effective, and ultimately more flexible, system of airport regulation and also on aspects of government airports policy.
20. The CC's provisional findings were considered by the UKACCs Working Group at its meeting on 12 January 2009 and it was agreed that a letter should be sent to the CC on behalf of the Liaison Group. The text of the letter is reproduced at Annex C1
21. Having considered the responses to its provisional decision document the CC published its final report on 19 March 2009. There is a summary of the finding at Annex C2 to this paper. The main points are that BAA must sell Gatwick, Stansted and either Edinburgh or Glasgow within two years. They are to be sold in sequence, beginning with Gatwick, then Stansted, followed by either Edinburgh or Glasgow. The sale of Gatwick was initiated by BAA in September 2008 and the sales process is already under way.
22. The CC is also requiring BAA at Aberdeen to improve consultation with airlines as well as to publish certain financial and other information. In addition, the CC is recommending to the airports' regulator, the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), that it should take certain specified action at Heathrow, the UK's only hub airport, where BAA will continue to have substantial market power even after the sale of Gatwick and Stansted. Further, the CC is making recommendations to the Government on aspects of government airports' policy as well as the present review of the airports regulatory regime.

Review of Public Safety Zones (PSZs)

23. At the Annual Meeting last year members heard that the technical refresh of the PSZ Model has been completed by the Department's contractors, NATS, and that the review of existing PSZs would start later in 2008. The initial scope of the review would focus largely on those airports which have shown, from the CAA Airport statistics, the strongest increase in aircraft movements since the current PSZs were established.

⁵ http://www.competition-commission.org.uk/inquiries/ref2007/airports/provisional_decision_remedies.htm

24. In a recent update the Department says that work to revise the existing PSZs has now commenced, with revised PSZs recently being established at Southampton Airport. Following Departmental policy these are based on traffic forecasts for 2024 (i.e. 15 years ahead); the previous PSZs used 2015 traffic forecasts
25. Meanwhile, it remains a concern that as the number of flights at an airport increases the area covered by a PSZ apparently gets larger. Thus, people living in homes built outside the current PSZ might find themselves living within the new PSZ flowing from the current review. It is understood that in such circumstances the planning status of homes is not affected but concerns have been expressed whether such dwellings are blighted by the new PSZ reducing their value and making them difficult to sell. This is, perhaps, a concern which might be raised with the Government?

The Planning Act 2008

26. The Planning Bill, introduced into Parliament in November 2007, received the Royal Assent on 26 November 2008. The new Act builds on the proposals set out in the Planning White Paper (published in May 2007) and introduces a new system for nationally significant infrastructure planning, alongside further reforms to the town and country planning system.
27. The Act makes provision for the Government to produce National Policy Statements (NPS) which will provide a comprehensive view of the case for national infrastructure development within a wide policy framework, covering economic, environmental and social issues.
28. The Government has stated its intention to produce a National Policy Statement for airports, based on the Air Transport White Paper (ATWP), which satisfies the requirements set out in the Planning Act. It will therefore be subject to an appraisal of sustainability, consultation and Parliamentary scrutiny. One option is to produce the airports NPS in conjunction with the next ATWP progress report which the Government is due to publish between 2009 and 2011. During the passage of the Planning Bill, ministers also made a commitment that the airports NPS (as well as the nuclear power NPS) would be location-specific. This means that the airports NPS will not only cover the national need, but it will also set out locations that the Government thinks are suitable for nationally significant development, and areas which it considers are not suitable”.
29. In January 2009 the Government published its Route Map for the implementation of the Infrastructure Planning Commission as well as a consultation document on the list of statutory consultees for National Policy Statements. The consultation closed on 20 April 2009. After an e-mail consultation with UKACCs members the Secretariat submitted a response⁶ to the effect that individual airport consultative committees should be included in the formal list of those bodies and organisations to be consulted in any subsequent guidance to be issued setting out the detailed procedures to be followed in the preparation of any NPS which has a bearing on airports or aviation. It was also mentioned that if needs be UKACCS was happy to operate as an agent in distributing consultation material to its member committees or by providing up-to-date contact details as and when required.
30. On 30 March 2009 the Government launched a consultation seeking views on a suite of draft regulations and guidance documents which set out the procedures for pre-application consultation on “nationally significant infrastructure projects”, and information an application submitted to the *Infrastructure Planning Commission* (IPC) should contain. The IPC will consider and determine nationally significant infrastructure projects which in relation to existing airports means developments which have the effect of increasing the number of passengers by at least 10 million per year or increasing by at least 10,000 per year the number of air transport movements of cargo aircraft. The deadline for comments is 19 June 2009.

⁶ <http://www.ukacccs.info/npsresponse140409.pdf>

Planning Applications – Notification and Consultation

31. At the Annual Meeting at Heathrow last year the Liaison Group noted a paper about the scope for inconsistency in informing/consulting local residents about planning applications which have an impact on the area of more than one local authority.
32. The issue had arisen from a planning application submitted by London City Airport to increase the permitted number of flights. London City Airport lies within the southern part of the Borough of Newham. It had become clear that the same steps had not been taken to inform residents living outside the boundaries of Newham in Tower Hamlets and Greenwich where the impact of the application would be similar and who might wish to make representations.
33. It was felt that clearer guidance and procedures were needed to ensure that all residents affected by airport planning applications were notified/consulted and it was agreed the Secretariat should write to the *Local Government Association (LGA)* and the *Association of London Government (ALG)* requesting that they use their influence with their members to ensure a common approach was adopted amongst all local authorities whose residents were affected by airport planning applications. The LGA should also be asked to urge the *Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)* to provide more comprehensive guidance on the consultation arrangements across local authority boundaries.
34. Meanwhile the *London City Airport Consultative Committee (LCACC)* had resolved to take up the issue with the DCLG and it was decided to delay referral of the issues to the LGA and ALG until the DCLG had responded.
35. The LCACC wrote to the DCLG on 9 July 2008 but unfortunately in spite of reminders by both the LCACC and the DfT there has so far been no response.

Airspace Change Proposals – London’s Terminal Control North

36. At the last Annual Meeting concerns were expressed about the lack of consistency in the approach adopted by NATS in its consultations with consultative committees on the plans to change the routes taken by aircraft in London’s *Terminal Control North*. There were also concerns about the manner in which NATS had handled consultation with affected local authorities. The guidance agreed last year on the procedures to be adopted for airspace change proposals (CAP 725) might need to be reviewed. The Liaison Group agreed to write to the CAA to express concern about the lack of consistency.
37. In its reply, copies of which were sent to all members, NATS said there were currently no formal plans to revise the guidance contained in CAP 725. However, following the decision on the TCN proposals the CAA would “review the progression of a proposal in order to identify any areas of weakness in the process or its associated guidance.” The Liaison Group’s comments on consistency of approach would be considered as part of that exercise.
38. Meanwhile NATS has said that in the light of the feedback received during that consultation period, they would be looking at further options in relation to some of the proposals. Later they said they planned a new consultation on revised proposals. Arising from the original consultation NATS did pursue plans to make minor modifications to the *Standard Instrument Departures* for London City Airport to accommodate the jet aircraft which use the airport today, rather than the slower propeller aircraft for which the existing procedures were first designed in the 1980s.

Air Passenger Duty (APD)

39. In the pre-Budget Report in 2007, the Government announced that it intended to replace air passenger duty with a duty payable per-plane, rather than per-passenger. This it was thought would send better environmental signals and ensure “that aviation makes a greater contribution to covering its environmental costs, while ensuring that a fair level of revenue continues to be raised from the sector in order to support public services”.
40. The Government consulted on proposals for a per-plane tax in 2008. In the event the Government decided not to proceed with a per-plane tax and instead to reform Air

Passenger Duty (APD). The main element of the reform of APD is to double the number of distance bands. From 1 November 2009, APD will be structured around four distance bands, set at intervals of 2,000 miles from London. The Government says this reform will ensure that those flying further, and therefore contributing more to emissions from aviation, will pay more. But members will be aware that the new arrangements have given rise to considerable concern in the industry.

41. Meanwhile there is ongoing disquiet about the practice of some airlines of charging fees for reclaiming APD when a passenger has to cancel a flight. A report by *Which?Holiday* published in March 2009 found Jet2.com charged £40 per APD reclaim transaction, while Flybe and bmi charged £25 per person, BA between £15 and £30 per person and Ryanair £15 per person. This compares with the current APD charge of £10 on short-haul economy flights. In some instances passengers are thus worse off if they make a claim. "Airlines should not be the automatic beneficiary of any unclaimed APD," said the report, "we think that any administration fees that put people off claiming back the APD are unfair." This is an issue taken up by the AUC some time ago but without success.

Wind farms – Effect on Radar

42. For some years members have been expressing concerns about the impact which wind farms have on the operation of radar installations and thus on the safety of aircraft.
43. At the last Annual meeting at Heathrow concerns were expressed about the costs incurred by airports in preparing radar assessments as a result of applications for the development of wind farms. The meeting thought such costs should be borne by the developer and not the airport. This would also help to prevent speculative applications. Delegates also raised concerns about safety issues. It was agreed there was a need for the CAA to produce clearer guidance on the effect of wind farms on radar and it was felt that the Government should be urged to produce guidance to local planning authorities to require developers to submit a radar assessment with planning applications.
44. In February 2009, the CAA re-issued CAP 764 *CAA Policy and Guidelines on Wind Turbines*. Since the initial release of CAP 764 in 2006, the way in which aviation stakeholders and wind turbine developers interact is said to have matured, and the revised document includes updates on Government renewable energy policy and details of how all interested parties should interact. Additionally, the scope of the document has been widened to include all aspects of aviation that may be affected by wind turbines. Appendix 7 of the document spells out a simplified method for determining if a wind turbine is in line of sight of an aeronautical radar station. And Chapter 5 provides guidance on the wind turbine development planning process which encourages a pre-planning application process involving engagement and consultation with aviation stakeholders. However, the revised document does not address the issue of who should bear the cost of undertaking a radar impact assessment.
45. The Department for Transport's recent reply to the representations sent to them following the last Annual Meeting is at Annex D1.
46. The Secretariat will continue to press these issues with the CAA and the DfT. Meanwhile, as mentioned in the Department's letter there is some very useful reference material on the website of the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) and in particular the page on *Offshore Wind: Aeronautical and Military Impacts*⁷ which is reproduced in full at Annex D2 to this paper.

Aircraft Noise Monitoring Advisory Committee (ANMAC)

47. This Committee was set up by the Department for Transport to advise them on policy relating to aircraft noise at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted⁸. Its membership includes representatives from NATS, BAA, the Environmental Research and Consultancy Department of the CAA, the Scheduling Committees and a representative of the

⁷ <http://www.berr.gov.uk/energy/sources/renewables/planning/offshore-wind/aeronautical/page18832.html>

⁸ Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted are designated for the purposes of s.78 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982 and noise amelioration is thus the responsibility of the Secretary of State.

consultative committee at each of the three airports each accompanied by a technical adviser.

48. There has been growing concern that ANMAC was now considering wider aircraft noise issues, not just those relating to the three London airports. An example of this was the further research proposed in connection with ANASE – see paras 50 to 54 below. In view of this the UKACCs Working Group at its meeting in January 2009 looked at the terms of reference and membership of ANMAC to see if any changes were needed.
49. It was concluded that the key focus of the group continued to be the development of noise policy and the consideration of noise issues at the three designated airports in London. There was thus a need for the discussions at ANMAC to be kept as private as possible to aid future policy development and to avoid the possibility of unnecessary anxiety among the communities affected by aircraft noise (or to raise hopes). In that ANMAC was considering wider noise issues the DfT's publication of a summary of the proceedings of the meetings was a welcome step forward. It was agreed to ask that UKACCs support service should be included on the circulation list of the summary so that member committees could be kept informed about the work of ANMAC.
50. If, however, ANMAC were to suggest changes in the management of aircraft noise or flight procedures of wider significance than just the three London airports, it was important that these should be subject to wider involvement and consultation with other airports.

Attitudes to Noise from Aircraft Sources in England (ANASE)

51. As previously reported this long running study was launched in May 2001. Its aim was to research how people feel about aircraft noise and especially how they perceive the relationship between noise levels and annoyance, or sleep disturbance at night, and how they would value lower noise levels relative to other environmental factors.
52. The results of the study were finally published by the Department early in November 2007 - the consultants' report, together with peer reviews and Departmental statement papers, can be seen on the DfT website⁹.
53. In the press release issued when the report was published the Department said two key conclusions emerged from the study. First, that people are more annoyed by all levels of aircraft noise than they were in 1985, when the last major study in this field was carried out. Secondly, there was no identifiable threshold at which noise becomes a serious problem. Even relatively low levels of noise can cause some annoyance, which rises as the noise increases.
54. The Government added they would take these findings into account in developing air transport policy. However, as the peer review makes clear, the study does not provide a reliable way of attaching a monetary figure to the impact of aircraft noise. Pending the availability of a better alternative, the Government would continue to apply the existing valuation for road and rail noise when assessing the economic impact of noise in the cost-benefit analysis of future aviation projects. This, they said, was in line with the procedure introduced for road and rail in 2006.
55. As advised at the Annual Meeting last year the Department has held a number of seminars with key stakeholders to review the study. In particular the Department is working with its ANMAC (whose role is to advise the Department on policy relating to aircraft noise at Heathrow Gatwick and Stansted – see paras 46-49 above) on the scope for further work to follow up ANASE findings. For example, work is in hand to consider the scope for noise modelling at lower levels.

Civil Aviation Act 2006

56. The Civil Aviation Act 2006, which received the Royal Assent on 8 November 2006, implemented important White Paper commitments to sustainable aviation and the protection of passenger interests. Among other things the Act:

⁹ <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/aviation/environmentalissues/Anase>

- Clarifies and strengthens the measures available to airports for dealing with aircraft noise. This includes a greater ability to introduce and enforce noise amelioration measures beyond airport boundaries and an ability to take economic measures to reflect aircraft straying from routes designed to minimise noise.
 - Provides explicit powers for airports to set charges which reflect local emissions from aircraft. The Secretary of State also has powers to direct airports to levy such charges.
57. As reported at the last Annual Meeting at Heathrow, the DfT's December 2006 *Progress Report on the White Paper The Future of Air Transport* recommended (on page 32) that airport consultative committees should monitor how well the new powers in the 2006 Act were being implemented by airports. It was thus on 8 April 2008 that the Department wrote to all Consultative Committees in England and Wales to seek their views on how airports have used these powers to date. Committees in Scotland received a similar letter from the Scottish Executive.
58. The Department says it is grateful for the responses received from the various committees. These largely indicated that - whilst the airports welcomed the availability of the new powers - existing noise mitigation procedures appeared to be operating effectively. The Department is proposing to review the situation once the current round of END noise action planning is completed later in the year. The development of noise action plans will provide a valuable opportunity for the airport to review its noise mitigation measures in consultation with the local community.

Sustainable Aviation – Report on Emissions

59. *Sustainable Aviation* was set up in 2005. It brings together the main players from UK airlines, airports, manufacturers and ATM providers. It aims for is a long term strategy which sets out the collective approach of UK aviation to tackling the challenge of ensuring a sustainable future for the industry.
60. In December 2008 the group published its first report mapping the industry's carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions to 2050. The report concludes that CO₂ from UK civil aviation can return to 2000 levels by 2050, after having reached a peak around 2020, against a background of threefold growth in passenger numbers.
61. The assessment takes into account the UK air transport market maturity and efficiencies expected from new airframe and engine technology, cutting edge air traffic management and operations, as well as the development of sustainable fuels. In making this assessment no allowance was made for the additional contribution to CO₂ reductions which will be achieved through airlines' participation in international emissions cap and trade schemes, the details of which had yet to be fully defined.
62. The report highlights that:
- Improvements in current airframe and engine design, plus new technologies such as blended wing bodies and open rotor engines, are expected to reduce CO₂ emissions by 62 per cent compared with a 'constant technology' baseline.
 - A further 10 per cent reduction is envisaged from improved air traffic management and operations which will be delivered by 2020.
 - Lower carbon alternative fuels are expected to provide a further 10 per cent reduction in CO₂ emissions from 2030, following a period of increasing deployment from 2020.
 - Given these initiatives, overall absolute levels of CO₂ from UK aviation are expected to be brought back down to 2000 levels by 2050.
63. As this paper was being finalised *Sustainable Aviation* published its second progress report¹⁰ which focuses on its *Roadmap to 2050* as described above. In issuing the report the chair of *Sustainable Aviation* said the report "clearly demonstrates that the aviation industry is delivering significant economic and social benefits for Britain, whilst also further reducing its environmental impact. The technology developed by our industry will play a major role in providing further

¹⁰ <http://www.sustainableaviation.co.uk/pages/default/key-documents.html>

solutions to the environmental challenges we face. It also enables us to be confident that we will continue to deliver for Britain as it recovers from recession.”

Omega

64. Omega is a publicly funded partnership which offers impartial, innovative and topical insights into the environmental effects of the air transport industry and sustainability solutions.
65. The partnership embraces nine UK universities led by Manchester Metropolitan University with Cambridge and Cranfield. Other partners include Leeds, Loughborough, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield and Southampton. It draws on the expert skills in these institutions including the environmental and social sciences, technology, business, economics, environment, politics and global regulation.
66. On 4-5 March 2009 Omega held a dissemination seminar when an overview report was published. The purpose was to present knowledge transfer outputs and key achievements of the first two years during which Omega has been co-ordinating research on some 40 projects divided into eight key areas. An extract from the report, covering the eight key areas, is reproduced at Annex E to the paper.
67. Omega is now seeking funding to continue with the work for several years.

Access to Air Travel for Disabled People

68. European Regulation (EC) 1107/2006 – which deals with the rights of people with reduced mobility (PRMs) when travelling by air – took effect on 26 July 2008. Among other things the Regulation provides that the managing bodies of airports should have the overall responsibility for providing assistance to PRMs. At many airports this meant a considerable change when compared to earlier practice which normally involved the provision of such services by the airlines.
69. Nearly a year has gone by and in preparing for this meeting the Secretariat at the beginning of March 2009 asked members whether the implementation of the new arrangements had been smooth and trouble free or whether there had been problems.
70. The response of responding members can be seen at Annex F. The responses show that at some airports the shift to the new arrangements had not been entirely trouble free and in one or two places there are problems which remain to be solved. A recurring theme is the need for PRMs requiring assistance to tell the airline, and thus the airport, at least 48 Hours in advance that help will be needed. This is, of course, a key factor in providing a good service and on which members might like to share their experience.

Charges for Airport Services

71. There is growing concern among passengers and in the media about the recent trend among some airports to introduce charges for services which were once provided free of charge as part of the airport service. These include:
 - a) *Charges for so-called Fast Track security lanes which allow passengers to by-pass the ordinary security facilities* – such facilities have already been introduced at Liverpool, Bristol, Luton, Leeds Bradford and possibly other airports.
 - b) *Charges for the transparent, re-sealable bags which must be used by passengers carrying liquids, gels and aerosols in their hand baggage* – it is understood that such charges have been introduced at Manchester, Liverpool, Bristol and Luton and possibly other airports. The BAA says that at its seven airports the bags will continue to be supplied free of charge.
 - c) *Charges for baggage trolleys* – charges for baggage trolleys already operate at Manchester, Luton and Bristol and perhaps at other Airports too.
 - d) *Charges to use the passenger drop off facility outside the airport terminal* – for example Birmingham Airport charges £1 for 15 minutes for its "drop and go" car park next to the terminals, or £2 for 30 minutes. In April it was reported that Luton would introduce a £1 charge for dropping passengers off at the terminal with a 10 minute time limit although in

May there were press reports that this charge had been postponed and might be dropped altogether.

- e) *Airport Development Fees* – since April 2007 Norwich Airport has charged each adult departing passenger a fee of £3 (£1 for children aged 2-15). This is to “provide funding for improved check-in facilities, retail and catering and car parking as well as to improve aircraft services such as runway, taxiway and aprons, safety and security systems for safe landing, take-off and efficient management of aircraft.” A similar fee of £5 for all departing passengers under 16 years of age has been charged by Newquay Airport since 2005. Maybe delegates know of other airports where such a charge is made?
72. There is more about charges for security related services in the *UK Security Update* paper elsewhere on the agenda
73. The new charges need to be seen in the context of the economic downturn. A letter sent to the Government last month by the *Airport Operators Association* (AOA) details how abruptly the airports' fortunes have reversed. According to the Association several airports are already making a loss, and more will become loss-making as the year progresses. The AOA's letter calls on the Government not to press ahead with new policies and legislation including Ofcom's proposals which would mean airport's paying significantly more for radar and VHF systems, and the *Policing and Crime Bill* which will mean that many airports will have to pay, or pay more, towards the cost of airport policing.
74. According to many observers the financial situation leaves airports with little choice but to consider new revenue streams with many following the example of the budget airlines in seeking out new ways of charging passengers. The AOA says that many of the new schemes are not mandatory but give passengers “additional choice”. That, of course begs the question whether the standard of the ordinary service is acceptable.
75. According to a report received by one consultative committee passenger research suggests that one of the key drivers for people using the new fast track security facility is that it offers a simple, hassle free environment and ease of navigation. The report says that passengers using low cost carriers are generally willing to pay small supplements for ‘added benefits’ such as fast track security and airline innovations such as ‘Speedy Boarding’ and Web Check-in.
76. The *Air Transport Users Council* certainly believes passengers will be targeted with more charges but they will take it up increases with the airports concerned. The budget airlines have complained that the charges are driving more passengers away and they may stop operating out of airports which have excessive charges.
77. There have been suggestions that the new charges have been brought about by increased airport security requirements. However, the Department for Transport says there has been no major tightening of security measures at UK airports since the alert of August 2006; indeed since then there have been several relaxations which have reduced the burden on airport operators.

Swine Flu

78. As this paper was being finalised the media focus on the swine flu epidemic was beginning to wane. Much of the news attention centred on airports and airlines. On 29th April the *Health Protection Agency* said it was enhancing its presence at airports in England to provide all passengers arriving from Mexico with information and advice on swine flu. A number of Airports issued advice to passengers and as did the airlines, see for example the AOA news item at Annex G distributed to all members at the end of April 2009. IATA also issued a press release¹¹

Stuart Innes
May 2009

¹¹ <http://www.iata.org/pressroom/pr/2009-04-30-01.htm>

The Through Airport Passenger Experience

A CAA assessment of the passenger experience and airport operations at Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted and Manchester airports

Executive Summary

- (1) The overall conclusion from the interviews with key industry stakeholders was that the passenger experience at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted was generally acceptable when the relevant airport was not subject to any disruption. This was consistent with the CAA's passenger surveys which found that passengers were generally satisfied or very satisfied with their through airport journey.
- (2) The CAA's meetings with the airport operator and airlines at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted revealed that interfaces between service providers could be improved to increase resilience to the passenger journey particularly when disruptions occurred to the through airport journey.
- (3) The CAA noted the initiatives already underway at UK airports to improve passenger processing and in particular technology to facilitate self-service options. These developments often require joint working between service providers and the CAA welcomes these initiatives going forward.
- (4) The CAA's research revealed customer dissatisfaction with complaint handling by airport operators and airlines. Together with the passenger representative body in air travel, the CAA will encourage industry to improve procedures for complaint handling.⁷ Passenger representation both in local airport consultative committees and the consumer body for air travel could also be improved to put pressure on service providers to improve key areas of the through airport experience that impact most significantly on passengers.⁸
- (5) The CAA will continue to draw upon the available evidence to compare major UK airports against other UK airports and suitable overseas counterparts to identify those service areas that might warrant further analysis. In international benchmarks, customer service was an area where the UK airports fared relatively poorly to their counterparts overseas. The CAA proposes to share the findings with BAA and to request that it considers the implication and identify any appropriate remedial action. This was seen as a particular problem at the central search area at Heathrow.
- (6) The CAA found there was scope for improving key interfaces between service providers for disruption management as well as for routine operations. Developing and planning joint scenarios for times of disruption management could clarify roles and responsibilities between the airlines, airport operators, ground handlers and UK Border Agency. This could be expected to mitigate the effects of disruption on passengers, increasing the resilience of the through airport journey. Government policy could also be usefully updated to benefit passengers who are subject to delays due to night noise jet bans at Heathrow.
- (7) The CAA also identified scope for improving co-ordination at the following interfaces for routine operations, despite the obvious improvements in the passenger experience since the security issues of August 2006 and the opening of Heathrow Terminal 5:
 - i) Standards and procedures for baggage delivery;
 - ii) Improving staff rostering at central search and border control through better use of capacity forecasting information provided by the airlines;
 - iii) Standardisation of procedures affecting on time departures;
 - iv) Co-ordination between the airport operator and airlines for services provided to persons of reduced mobility.
- (8) The primary responsibility for driving forward improvements in these areas rests with the airport operator, the airlines and various other service providers involved. The CAA proposes, in the short term, to act as a catalyst to joint planning for disruption management and for improving routine interfaces. Industry is supportive of this proposal. The ability of

industry to achieve improved outcomes will depend on the continued willingness of airlines, airports and other suppliers to engage. The CAA agrees that its attendance at the initial industry working groups could help to ensure that processes are put in place to make improvements for joint planning. The CAA sees its involvement as a catalyst to industry taking leadership on co-ordination matters and is not proposing any longer term involvement. The CAA proposes to focus the exercise initially at Heathrow. Lessons learnt could then be translated to Gatwick and Stansted airports. The CAA proposes to report back on progress made at Heathrow in the summer.

Annex B
Economic Regulation of Stansted Airport 2009-2014
CAA Decision – Summary drawn from CAA Press Release

1) Price control decision

CAA decision for price cap on airport charges from passenger flights:
(Revenue yield £ per passenger)(Increase in price cap (retail price inflation plus X%)

2009/10

2009/10 prices = 6.53

2010/11

2009/10 prices = 6.53

RPI+0%

2011/12

2009/10 prices = 6.63

RPI+1.63%

2012/13

2009/10 prices = 6.74

RPI+1.63%

2013/14

2009/10 prices = 6.85

RPI+1.63%

CAA decision for price cap on airport charges for non-passenger flights:

Airport charges for landing and parking should be no higher than those for comparable passenger aircraft

2) Service quality incentive scheme

In response to the Competition Commission's finding that Stansted Airport's service performance has been at times unacceptably low during the past five years, the CAA has implemented a regime of service standards with financial incentives, in the form of rebates from the airport to the airlines when standards are not met. This would put at risk up to 7 per cent of Stansted's airport charge revenue from passenger flights, if it were to fail to deliver on all of the service measures throughout any one financial year. The rebates are focused particularly on those areas which are most critical to the efficient operation of the 'low cost' airline model at Stansted, and which would thus be likely to deliver benefits to passengers.

The incentive scheme covers a range of areas, such as:

- Passenger security queues;
- Performance of baggage systems (both outbound and inbound);
- Measures of passenger service from terminal facilities: cleanliness, availability of seating, way-finding and flight information; and
- Services delivered directly to airlines, such as the availability of power supplies, pier-served stands.

Similar schemes at Heathrow and Gatwick have seen overall performance improve, but BAA still incurred some £4.9m and £3.8m respectively in rebate payments in the first 10 months of 2008/09 for areas where it was falling short of the standards set by the CAA.

Annex C BAA Market Review

(1) Text of letter sent on 13th January 2009 on behalf of the Liaison Group

“The Liaison Group is very concerned that the findings in the various documents published by the Commission seem to be driven by economists with little attention being given to the impact upon the organisation and operation of the UK air transport industry, which includes a wide range of organisations and interests not just airlines and airports. The sole concern of the Commission seems to be the creation of competition where it believes none exists today. The Commission’s remit has prevented it from looking at the much wider and complex picture of the aviation market notably the problem of preserving slots for regional services at Heathrow and Gatwick, and the UK plc’s competitive position within Europe’s airports market .

“We do not believe that the Commission has set out compelling evidence to support its view that selling Stansted as well as Gatwick will increase competition and, moreover, there is no compelling evidence to underpin its contention that Edinburgh and Glasgow airports would compete if they were under separate ownership. It appears that the Commission has consistently ignored a substantial body of evidence, particularly from a range of organisations in Scotland, which have consistently stated that the two airports are serving two separate markets. There is moreover no reasonable justification for specifying which of the two Scottish airports should be sold. We also consider that there is no reasonable justification to set a price cap at Aberdeen Airport without first taking into account the organisation and operation of other airports in similar remote geographical locations in the UK.

“The results from the introduction of competition are not always good for consumers, it may cause them to suffer from its effects.

“The Commission’s decisions, if proceeded with in forcing a sale of both Gatwick and Stansted airports in the near future, can only result in the introduction of confusion in the minds of potential purchasers at a time when a public inquiry into plans for a second runway at Stansted is in the offing and a decision by Government into plans for the expansion of capacity at Heathrow are expected this month.

“Should Government decide not to progress plans for expansion of Heathrow, the pressures currently being experienced there can only intensify with no certainty that it can be relieved at Stansted or, indeed, that a second runway could be built at Gatwick after 2018 by any new owners.

“It is unfortunate that the Commission intends to make a final decision in this matter by March 2009 when there will still be a number of important issues to be resolved which affect the issue.”

(2) Main conclusions of the final report of the Competition Commission

Competition Problems

The main competition problems identified in the CC’s report are:

- Common ownership of Edinburgh and Glasgow airports is a feature which prevents competition between them.
- Common ownership of the three BAA London airports is a feature of the market which prevents competition between them; the intensity of price competition may initially be limited by current capacity constraints and price controls, but these constraints are themselves at least in part the result of common ownership.

- Common ownership of Southampton with Heathrow and Gatwick is a feature of the market which prevents competition between them; there is scope for competition from Heathrow and Gatwick to have an impact on Southampton, although the potential for competition to have an impact on Southampton is greater from Gatwick than Heathrow.
- Common ownership of the BAA London airports is also a feature of the market that, inter alia, restricts or distorts competition between airports in relation to capacity development.
- Common ownership of the BAA London airports also exacerbates the inadequacies of the regulatory system, reducing the benefits of regulation and distorting competition between airlines.
- Aberdeen's comparatively isolated geographical position relative to other centres of population combined with other factors that make it unattractive to serve a catchment of Aberdeen's size with more than one airport and that deter entry are features that restrict airport competition.
- Heathrow's position as the only significant hub airport in the South-East, and indeed the UK, is itself a feature that restricts competition between airports.
- Aspects of the planning system are a feature which restricts and/or distorts competition by acting as a barrier to entry of new airports and expansion of existing ones.
- Aspects of government policy are features which restrict or distort competition between airports.
- The current regulatory system for airports is also a feature which distorts competition between airlines.

The Remedies

The Commission requires the sale of both Gatwick (although BAA has already started the sales process) and Stansted airports to different purchasers, as well as one of Edinburgh or Glasgow airports. A monitoring trustee will oversee the sales processes.

With the Gatwick sales process already under way, BAA will next be required to sell Stansted, followed by either Edinburgh or Glasgow, at its discretion. The dates by which each of the sales has to be completed is not being published so as not to prejudice an effective sales process; but the end date is less than two years from the date of our report. If the sales are not completed by the specified dates, the CC reserves the right, in each case, to appoint an independent divestiture trustee to carry out the sales. The timetable may be subject to revision should a material change in circumstances make this appropriate.

BAA will be required to sell the divestiture airports to suitable purchasers approved by the CC. They should be independent of BAA, should have the intention, appropriate expertise and financial resources to operate and develop the airports as effective competitors and should not create further competitive concerns as a result of divestiture.

At Aberdeen, BAA must improve consultation with airlines as well as publish certain financial and other information.

Airport Regulation

Ahead of any longer-term changes to airport regulation introduced by the DfT, the CC are recommending to the CAA that it should strengthen the consultation process at Heathrow through the provision of necessary information and better processes of consultation between BAA and the airlines, as well as introducing annual independent audits of the existing service quality regime

In relation to the present review of airport regulation, the CC fully supports a licensing regime of the kind proposed by the DfT, as it would introduce more flexibility to the regulation of airports; for example, the regulator would be able to relax the intensity of regulatory scrutiny, where it saw opportunities for increased competition. The Commission has also recommended to the DfT that:

- The regulator's primary objective should be the promotion of the consumer interest wherever possible through the promotion of competition. There should be an ancillary

duty to consult and pay due regard to the views of airlines as well as to consult designated passenger groups and airport operators.

- Appeals against price control and service quality licence modifications made by the regulator should be made to the CC. The right to appeal should lie with the relevant airport, individual airlines and designated passenger groups.
- Legislation should be amended to allow for terminals to be developed or redeveloped and operated separately from runway facilities.

Airports Policy

In relation to airports policy, the CC recommends that the DfT should, in the context of the development of the forthcoming *National Policy Statement (NPS)* on airports, consider the impact of the White Paper on the aviation market, particularly in the South-East in the light of the divestment of Gatwick and Stansted. It should ensure that the NPS on airports does not unduly constrain this market and should give consideration to the ambitions of the new owner of Gatwick Airport, including the possibility of a second runway after 2019.

Annex D1

Letter from the Department for Transport *Impact of wind farm developments on the operation of airfields*

As you note in your letter, this Department is working closely with the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC), the Ministry of Defence, the Civil Aviation Authority, air navigation service providers, airports and wind farm developers to make progress on overcoming the technical problems around radar and wind farm developments. We are fully engaged with work that is being undertaken to assess in more detail the possible effects of wind farm developments on radar performance, and we are committed to finding equitable solutions to mitigate them. You might wish to note the following link to the BERR website where you can access documents related to the interaction between aviation and wind farms:

<http://www.berr.gov.uk/energy/sources/renewables/planning/onshore-wind/aeronautical/page18755.html>.

In particular, I draw your attention to the “Memorandum of Understanding: aviation radar and wind turbines (mitigation issues)” and “Aviation plan: in respect to the interaction between wind turbines and aviation interests”.

Turning to your specific concern on the costs borne by airport operators in determining the impact of a proposed wind farm development on an airport, you suggest that, in light of the increasing number of proposals, such costs should be borne by the wind farm developer.

Whilst I recognise the increasing resourcing issue that such proposals place on airport operators, particularly in the current economic climate, I am sure you would agree that it is the airport operator who is best placed to provide an expert view on how a development would influence their operations. That is why, for example, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) are obliged to consult operations managers at officially safeguarded aerodromes about any proposed developments which might have an effect on safety at that aerodrome. Airport operators must assess the impact of the proposed wind turbine development in accordance with guidance issued by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) to ensure that their operation is appropriately safeguarded and, where necessary, that mitigations are put in place to maintain safety and operational standards. Such assessment will be based upon the licensing requirements of CAP 168 - Aerodrome Licensing.

From the wind farm developer’s perspective, one might argue that they would have difficulty in funding assessment work undertaken by the airport operator when the operator, for understandable reasons, has a vested interest in the result.

Given that airport operators and wind farm developers potentially might view each other as burdens on their respective operations, the government and, in particular, the CAA, seeks a co-operative approach between each party. We recognise that each party is a commercial operation with particular commercial interests but each must be reasonable in their approach. This does suggest that there might be some circumstances in which developers and operators might seek opportunities to co-operate on resourcing issues through identifying shared benefits?

On the issue of wind turbine safeguarding maps, might I suggest that your membership would be better placed to update you on the development of such maps as responsibility for their production lies with the airport operator. As you note, the CAA's guidance CAP 764 recommends that airport operators develop wind turbine safeguarding maps to illustrate where developments might or might not be feasible. The CAA reinforces the use of these maps as they contribute to a strategic approach to wind turbine development planning, assist LPAs in much the same way as physical safeguarding maps which airports already lodge with LPAs, and relieve the burden placed on airports in dealing with a large number of wind farm development applicants as they inform developers on potential areas of conflict.

Furthermore, you will see from the above mentioned Memorandum of Understanding and Aviation Plan that the Department for Energy and Climate Change is leading a key work-stream on the development of an interactive web-based screening tool for use by developers during the site-selection stages of project development. The work-stream aims to develop improved on-line mapping and database information on all existing and proposed wind farm developments to assist all parties in better disseminating relevant information on proposals and thereby reduce speculative applications and help manage limited resources. An interim tool (http://www.restats.org.uk/aviation/safe_guarding_maps.htm) went "live" in November 2008 hosting maps provided by NATS and CAA; further maps, including those from MoD, are due for incorporation soon.

Annex D2

Extract from BERR Website

Offshore Wind Farms: Aeronautical and Military Impacts

Aeronautical Issues

Wind turbines can have an impact on aviation activities, typically on radar systems or on low flying. In 2001, BERR formed the *Wind Energy, Defence and Civil Aviation Interests Working Group* to consider the combined interests of wind farm developers, aviators and government. This group, with representatives from the Ministry of Defence (MoD), the Department for Transport, the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), the National Air Traffic Services (NATs), the Airport Operators Association, the British Wind Energy Association and government, has produced guidelines to facilitate the development of wind energy so as to meet the UK Government's targets, while recognising the interests of civil and military aviation.

The guidelines explain Government's policy and the need for wind energy, the issues relating to the potential impact of wind farms on aviation activity, and the planning and consultation process.

The Consultation Process

The MoD, CAA and NATs have a statutory duty to safeguard certain sites and airspace from radar interference in the interests of national security and for the safe operation of passenger and military aviation - this duty was restated in the 2003 Energy White Paper. Developers are encouraged to consult voluntarily with these bodies before their formal planning application is submitted in order to identify and, if possible, resolve issues.

Pre-planning consultation with these bodies is typically undertaken via a standard BWEA Wind farm *Developers Application Proforma*¹² in which developers list the exact locations, dimensions, construction details and output of all proposed turbines. Completed proformas are submitted to the MoD which consults with its various departments, as well as with the CAA and

¹² http://www.bwea.com/docs/developers_proforma.doc

NATs. If a site falls within 30 kilometre of a safeguarded aerodrome, the CAA generally devolves responsibility for safeguarding the aerodrome in question. Each development is assessed on a case-by-case basis. You can find further information in Civil Aviation Authority: Publication CAP 670 - *Air Traffic Services Safety Requirements*¹³.

The MoD submits holding objections to all wind energy proposals within line of sight of air defence radars, unless the developer can provide evidence that it will have no impact on the radars. Proposals within tactical training areas are also likely to raise objections.

The MoD has also placed safeguarding zones around other facilities. For example, it has imposed a precautionary zone around a seismic monitoring facility at Eskdalemuir. The facility constitutes a key part of a global network of facilities monitoring the current nuclear test ban treaty. Wind energy proposals within the safeguarding zone will be opposed. Outside this zone the MoD will make holding objections pending more detailed evaluation of proposals. This can affect projects up to an 80 kilometre radius of the facility.

The *Wind Energy, Defence and Civil Aviation Interests Working Group* is working to simplify and speed up the pre-planning consultation process and to develop a common and transparent assessment methodology.

The Aviation Plan

In addition to work to improve the processes of consultation and assessment, there is a substantial amount of other activity going on to identify, develop and implement solutions to the potential impacts that wind turbines can have on radar systems. It is recognised that it would be beneficial to draw this work together within a single plan in order to have a coordinated approach to finding solutions to the wind turbine – radar issue. Therefore, together with stakeholders in the aviation and wind development sectors, BERR has developed an *Aviation Plan*¹⁴ to move this work forward so that wind farms can be developed while, at the same time ensuring national security and the continued safe operation of our aviation environment. The structure and principles of the *Aviation Plan* were endorsed by the *Wind Energy, Defence and Civil Aviation Interests Working Group* in March 2008.

The overall aim of the *Aviation Plan* is to provide a suite of generic mitigation solutions to which wind farm developers and their aviation stakeholders can turn when discussing the best potential solutions for any particular wind proposal. The development of this suite of generic solutions will be an on-going process and will build on a number of solutions that are already available to wind farm developers.

The *Aviation Plan* will provide a tool to identify potential further solutions that offer the most promising prospects for allowing wind turbines and radar systems to co-exist. Importantly, it will allow stakeholders to monitor the progress of programmes of work that will be established to examine the potential of generic solutions and make them technically available. In order to achieve this, the Plan will include information on some key work-streams. These are the key programmes of work being planned and undertaken to find solutions to specific problems that wind turbines currently present to radar systems. For these work-streams, the Plan will present details of the project programmes, costs and the risks to the delivery of mitigation solutions. As such The *Aviation Plan* is a “living” document that will be updated as progress is made on existing work-streams and new ones are identified and included within the Plan.

The current version of the *Aviation Plan* presents a summary of the key work-streams that will be the focus of attention over the next months and years. The programmes, costs and risks to delivery of these work-streams still need to be formalised and as these matters are agreed the information will be included within the *Aviation Plan*.

To ensure the delivery of the *Aviation Plan*, it will be managed by a senior management board that will be advised by an advisory panel. A separate funding mechanism will also be established to ensure that the work-streams will have appropriate financial support.

The value of the *Aviation Plan* as a tool for enabling the development of mitigation solutions has been recognised by key stakeholders that have an interest in radar systems and wind farms. To

¹³ <http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/33/CAP670.PDF>

¹⁴ <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file49691.pdf>

ensure the success of the plan a number of these have signed a *Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)*¹⁵ to commit to the full implement the *Aviation Plan* and its approach to ensuring the timely and effective delivery of solutions to reduce the effect of wind turbines on aviation interests.

One of the commitments of the MoU was to establish a governance structure for the *Aviation Plan*. To this end an *Aviation Management Board* has been established with overall responsibility for the success of the Plan. This is supported by a panel of experts, *the Aviation Advisory Panel (AAP)*. The role of the AAP is to provide the AMB with information and advice on the progress of the *Aviation Plan* and its associated work-streams. Both these groups had their inaugural meetings in July 2008¹⁶. The AAP also met again in September.¹⁷

Annex E
The Omega Project

Extract from Report considered at dissemination seminar held on 4-5 March 2009

OMEGA (Opportunities for Managing the Environmental Challenges of Growth in Aviation) is a one-stop shop providing impartial world-class academic expertise on the environmental issues facing aviation. Working with a range of experts in the aviation sector, government and NGOs, it aims to provide robust, independent evidence. Its work is explained in detail on their web site (<http://www.omega.mmu.ac.uk>) and in downloadable detailed reports on most of the individual topics.

A dissemination seminar was held on 4-5 March 2009 when an overview report, also on the web site, was published. The purpose was to present knowledge transfer outputs and key achievements of the first two years when Omega has been co-ordinating research on some 40 projects divided into eight key areas.

Omega is now seeking funding to continue with the work for several years.

An extract from the report, covering the eight key areas is reproduced below.

1 *Climate change*

The climate change debate is about more than just carbon dioxide, and it's leading to more dialogue between scientists, economists and technologists about non-CO2 effects, trade-offs and the most cost-effective solutions. As such, Omega has set about developing the knowledge base on the climate effects of aviation, especially non-CO2 impacts and metrics to assess what matters most, so timescales for additional research and development can be defined. Omega has looked at the implications of global temperature change on growth; climate modelling of contrails and aviation-induced cirrus clouds; and the links between climate and technology.

2 *Local air quality*

One of Omega's aims is to help airports, airlines and other players in the industry and authorities address local airport emissions most effectively. Identifying where airport emissions are coming from isn't as easy as it sounds. Omega has brought together a number of studies to enhance understanding among measurement experts and modellers. In this section we look at the way aviation emissions disperse around airports as well as the source and character of emissions. The near airport benefits from improved measurement of particulates and state-of-the-art plume measurement to enable cleaner exhaust are also explored.

3 *Noise*

Determining what are acceptable levels of noise when it comes to aircraft is an extremely subjective area. Research under the Omega umbrella is seeking to offer answers to policymakers, authorities and the public. The goal is to develop a better understanding of community responses to noise so policies become more informed. It also means technological and operational responses can be fine-tuned. By examining the noise characteristics of new

¹⁵ <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file46583.pdf>

¹⁶ <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file49692.pdf> and <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file49693.pdf>

¹⁷ <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file49694.pdf>

aircraft we can uncover what potential there is to develop better technology, and the trade-offs between noise and emissions.

4 Aircraft systems

The aviation industry can reap big rewards by studying and assessing the environmental benefits and trade-offs associated with new and emerging technologies. By widening knowledge of environmental effects of technologies, future planning and development can be improved. But it's going to take a significant improvement in operating efficiency – 15 to 20 per cent – to persuade industrial giants such as Airbus and Boeing to launch their next-generation aircraft. We look at the prioritisation of emerging aircraft and engine technologies, and the barriers to introducing new technologies. We also weigh up the impact of implementing composite materials; investigate control strategies during cruise, landing and take-off cycles to see what impact they have on the environment; and find out what options there are for long-term, blue-sky technology.

5 Operations

While developing new technologies can go a long way to fighting the effects of climate change, it's not all dependent on aircraft technology. There are many benefits to be found by improving flight and ground operations. Removing inefficiencies from in-flight and airport operations is a big ambition. Omega has set out to identify what efficiency advances in air traffic management have been made and the potential for reducing the carbon intensity of the airport system. We look at the effects of charging regimes on air traffic routings, fleet turnover and life cycle.

6 Sustainable fuels

Sustainable fuels are expected to play a big part in the aviation industry's evolution. Rising fuel costs and availability are driving manufacturers to make aircraft more efficient. High-profile test flights have been conducted using a biofuel mix, but the challenges associated with introducing these alternatives are vast. Technology, safety, supply and infrastructure issues need to be overcome. Here we examine the performance of sustainable fuels to determine their viability, and look at the carbon intensity of production and trade-offs between CO₂ and other emissions.

7 Mitigation

Policy options for mitigating aviation environmental impacts include market-based measures, regulatory standards, restrictions and government-funded research and development. Aviation development is influenced by all these areas. There is a big debate about the role and efficacy of emissions trading for aviation which is to be introduced in Europe from 2011. Omega is looking at the adequacy of current cost-benefit analysis approaches, trade-off issues and barriers to change.

8 Demand

Studying future levels of aviation demand is important to get to grips with the scale of the environmental challenge. Omega is studying the drivers and enablers of demand; the public and commercial perception of need, the willingness to pay more for air travel, and the ways in which demand could be influenced.

Annex F **Services for people with reduced mobility (PRMs) when travelling by air** ***Response of Member Committees***

Aberdeen

BAA Aberdeen let the contract for providing services to PRMs to G4S, who already undertake a range of other specified security services at the airport. BAA Aberdeen procured two new 'ambulift' vehicles for the service and G4S increased their staffing complement by an appropriate amount and provided training. The airport's website provides information for PRMs requiring special assistance. There have been no problems with the implementation of the latest regulations.

Belfast

Implementation at Belfast City has been very smooth. The airport put the job out to tender, which was won by the same company who provide our security services. We therefore have a fairly integrated operation that seems to work well. The PRM team is based at a spare airline ticket desk so staff are convenient to the front door, check in and departures lounge etc.

Birmingham

Regarding implementation of the above at Birmingham International Airport, I'm advised that our contract was awarded a year before the legislation came into force. The main issue has been the pre-notification of PRM assistance. Although this has gradually been improving, there is still a way to go. We have had problems with airlines such as PIA and Air India who do not pre-advise at all. They have a high number of PRMs on their flights and this can be a drain on resources because it is not possible to plan for the requirement.

Linked into this is that the codes used for the type of assistance required are not always used correctly. More training of airline crew and ground handling staff with regard to the legislation, code of practice, disability awareness and equality training, and local airport knowledge may help to improve the service that is offered.

It is felt we now offer a better product, as we did not have designated seating areas, help points or a help desk prior to our award of contract and we have coped very well considering the Apron works in summer 2008 and the Pier works since then which have had an impact on Stand allocations requiring more ambulift movements.

OCS are an excellent pro-active service provider who are a credit to our airport

Bristol

The Airport outsourced the provision of services for people with reduced mobility to OCS with effect from 1st July 2008.

The operation was reasonably seamless and OCS has provided an excellent service.

There are, however, on going issues with -

- (a) the interpretation of eligibility under the legislation by the public;
- (b) advance notification; and
- (c) cost recovery.

There has been a significant increase in the number of people, who could be classed as 'able bodied', seeking to use this service and people arriving at the Airport and requesting assistance without prior notification. This has placed a strain on the service, particularly at peak times. It is difficult for the contractor to refuse to help when requested by members of the public and nor would they wish to do so.

The Airport has been working closely with the airline community to improve advance notification and this has now risen to 70%.

The lack of advance notification, and the increased demand for the service, resulted in a number of complaints being received during the peak period. However with the improvement in the notification process the situation has improved significantly.

The recovery of costs for this service is based on passenger numbers which have fallen quite considerably in recent months. Unfortunately PRM costs have not fallen and this will result in an uplift in cost to the airlines.

Cardiff

The implementation of the new regulation has for the PRM at Cardiff has been very successful, indeed we have had many compliments from our passengers and are delighted to be able to commend the service from here.

However the service has had its moments, particularly with the amount of non-pre-booked passengers we have experienced, which of course has a huge impact on planning. To offset this we have tried to raise the awareness of all personnel involved in this process.

We have found the airlines with the shorter turn around time more demanding and therefore require careful planning and monitoring.

On the whole I believe that the service now under the new regulations is more popular and anticipate an increase in numbers as more people become aware of its existence, with the result of increasing pressure on the logistics of the operation

Gatwick

In the first few months following the changes to the regulations, a number of problems with the service were experienced at Gatwick Airport. These were G4S resource levels, forecasting the number of passengers requiring assistance and some technical issues. Initially 80% of passengers with reduced mobility requiring assistance were non-prenotified so resource planning for staffing and equipment was very difficult.

Since then G4S, BAA Gatwick and the airlines have worked together to make improvements. There has been a marked improvement in the figures on pre-notification of passengers requiring assistance since May 2008 and the percentage of non pre-notified passengers has declined. The airport community is continuing to work together with the service provider to make improvements to the service. BA and Easyjet have made improvements in providing the information on PRM requirements available to them at the -36 hour deadline, however at times, nearer to departure (for late bookings etc.) this is more difficult. There is now greater sharing of information by the smaller airlines too. Complaints about the service have declined in the first few months of 2009 however the key months for PRM passengers are May, June and in the Autumn.

GATCOM highlighted the need for greater consistency in the way in which airlines provided advice and contact details for special assistance on their websites in addition to information exchange between all parties including airlines, handling agents and tour operators.

Glasgow

The implementation of the Regulation seems to have gone smoothly at Glasgow. In fact I recently saw an example of it when I dropped off a disabled friend who was going on holiday from the airport. All the arrangements for the wheelchair etc. were immediately on hand and my friend indicated everything was extremely well-handled right up to the departure gate.

Inverness

At Inverness Airport the contract was awarded to Dalcross Handling who up till then had only ever dealt with cargo. The staff however welcomed the opportunity to have interaction with passengers and this has proved a resounding success.

London City

London City has provided the service to passengers with reduced mobility for a number of years now. It's successful implementation and provision of service has seen an increase of passengers using the service, including passengers choosing to use London City instead of other airports.

We have experienced occasional problems with the receipt of prior notification, but in fairness, this did not have a detrimental effect to the service provided to the passenger. We also address any prior notification delays with the airline concerned.

Luton

As far as Luton is concerned there are several points to mention.

London Luton Airport has outsourced the service and, although there were some initial teething problems, there have been recent improvements. A range of additional facilities and help points have been provided, including using a double shop unit just inside the entrance to the departures area. The three main external help points, situated in the short-term car park, public transport bays and drop-off zone, are specifically designed for the visually and/or hearing impaired traveller by having audio, hands free phone and integral induction loop facility.

It is of concern that many PRM passengers do not pre-notify.

Manchester

The contract to provide the service for Passengers with Reduced Mobility (PRMs) was let to OCS well in time for July 2008, and had been preceded by close working with the Company in the lead in to the “go live” date. OCS have performed well, and there have been few problems over the introduction of the new arrangements. Feedback about their experience obtained from passengers since last year has been very positive.

The Airport has been proactive in introducing new facilities for people with disability, to further help PRMs in the course of their journey. There is a Reception Point for people needing assistance in each of the Terminals, with the benefit of “enhanced” seating in the immediate area more suited to the needs of PRMs. Help Points have been established in key places such as Car Parks, Drop Off Zones and the Ground Transport Interchange to assist people especially on arrival. More recently trials have been undertaken with an “Eagle Lift Hoist” involving a number of different carriers and aircraft types, which will further help with the transfer to the Aircraft. The Airport is also exploring the use of motorised buggy carts to help people move around the site more easily.

The Airport management operational support system receives prenotification messages from the Airlines in the standardised IATA format. At October 2008 62% of the Airlines were providing prenotification, but only 37% contained fully accurate information. By January this year 85% of carriers were compliant with the EC Regulation, increasing in April to 91%.

The Consultative Committee continues to receive a report on progress at each meeting, and is satisfied that there has been a very effective response to the requirements introduced by the Regulation. The Committee will keep under review the performance levels in regard to prenotification.

Newcastle

I am not aware of any problems implementing the Regulation here. Newcastle Airport Company does the handling itself, as it always has done, and is proud of its reputation in coping well with PRMs. Of course there will always be the very occasional time when things do not go to plan but I think this reputation is well deserved.

Prestwick

Glasgow Prestwick Airport management have reported to GPACC, on a number of occasions, that the airport is fully PRM compliant.

However while the Committee are generally satisfied that this is the case it is difficult for the Committee to come to an independent judgement on this. To try to address this issue the Committee held an open discussion with 3 representatives of *South Ayrshire Access Forum*, prior to the November Meeting. This raised a number of issues particularly in relation to blind and visually impaired people. The Committee found this exchange extremely valuable and came to the following conclusions:

- awareness of the issue is key
- the need to incorporate the principle of equality of access for all into the culture of GPA's decision making.
- specifically the need to incorporate the principle of equality of access for all into all design processes from inception to completion. This should apply to all refurbishment and renewal as well as new build.
- GPA could usefully identify a notifiable person for access issues

In response to the recent Glasgow Prestwick Airport Draft Master Plan GPACC made the following comment:

"GPACC recognise that IAEL as GPA's operators are required to comply with the recent PRM legislation which came into force in July 2008. However the Committee would like to see the Airport take a more pro-active stance in this important area of access to GPA. GPACC would like the Final version of the Master Plan to make a specific commitment to working with the disabled community and in particular to undertake a thorough audit of existing facilities and procedures; to retrofit existing buildings and to 'disable proof' all

alterations and new build by incorporating equality of access for all into the design process from concept to completion"

Stansted

The new arrangements have worked well at Stansted.

One company, MITIE, was appointed to deal with all the work in relation to PRM passengers. It undertook an intensive training programme for its staff and also purchased new equipment. BAA was able to implement the new system about 2 months before the formal implementation date as everything was ready to go.

The Passenger Service Group of STACC received a presentation from MITIE prior to it taking on the role. Subsequently, the Group then paid a visit to the Terminal and watched the process in operation. One PSG member then went through the whole process (from arrival to plane) with an individual customer. Our PSG chairman has a particular interest in services for the disabled so this is something we keep a close eye on.

STACC's major concern is not what happens at the airport but what happens when the passenger arrives at the aircraft, as the Regulation does not apply there. With low cost airlines looking for quick turn rounds there is concern that passengers are dealt with with a lack of dignity once on board.

Annex G
AOA News Item about Swine Flu – 3^{0th} April 2009

Airlines "prepared for swine flu"

30 Apr 2009

Major airlines are well prepared to handle the threat of a swine flu epidemic, according to a leading aviation body.

Ulrich Schulte-Strathaus, secretary general of the Association of European Airlines (AEA), comments that the safety of the public is "always uppermost" in firms' minds.

He says that carriers on the continent are in a position from which they can deal with the problem, thanks to talks with some other leading bodies.

Mr Schulte-Strathaus adds: "The aviation sector has established guidelines on how best to deal with health risks; they were developed by [the] International Civil Aviation Organisation, in consultation with [the] World Health Organisation."

He goes on to comment as long as there is accurate information for passengers, they will be able to make the best decisions with regards to travel.

Earlier this week, Bristol International Airport revealed that it is working closely with the Health Protection Agency to allow those making trips to Mexico to obtain the latest details on the issue.