

GATWICK AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

GENERAL PURPOSES SUB-COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> January, 2003 at Gatwick Airport.

Present:

Mr. P.W. Bryant (Chairman)

Mr. D. Dewdney

Mrs. E. Kitchen

Mr. D. Murdoch

Dr. P. Ellis

Mr. J. McCall

Mr. G. Pixley

Mr. P. Feltham

Mr. N. Maltby

Mrs. H. Sewill

Ms. J. Houston

Also Present:

Mr. T. Lockwood - Director of Planning and Environment, BAA Gatwick

Mr. R. Norman – Flight Evaluation Unit Manager, BAA Gatwick

Mrs. S. Howells – Community Affairs, BAA Gatwick

Miss. C. Barrett - Community Affairs, BAA Gatwick

Dr. J. Godfrey – Deputy Honorary Secretary

Mrs. P. Street – Assistant Honorary Secretary

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs. E. Sampson.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3<sup>RD</sup> OCTOBER, 2002

31. Resolved – That the minutes of the Sub-Committee held on 3<sup>rd</sup> October, 2002 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

DRAFT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES – 24<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER, 2002

32. The Sub-Committee received and noted the draft minutes of the meeting of the Consultative Committee held on 24<sup>th</sup> October, 2002.

THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF AIR TRANSPORT IN THE UK: SOUTH EAST CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

33. The Sub-Committee considered a report by the Honorary Secretary giving details of the outcome of the Judicial Review by Essex, Kent and Medway Councils on the exclusion of options for Gatwick from the Government's consultation paper (copy attached to the signed minutes). Members noted that the Government had decided not to appeal against the High Court judgment and as a result the consultation process had been extended. A further South East consultation document including one or more new runway options at Gatwick would be published shortly, hopefully before the end of February, 2003.

34. Dr. Godfrey reported that a letter had already been sent to the Department for Transport inviting them to give a presentation to the Consultative Committee as soon as

possible following the publication of the revised consultation document. He had also made reference to the Department's public exhibition held in September, 2002, passing on members' comments about the location of the venue. A response had been received from the Department who were happy to accept in principle the invitation to give a presentation, and also confirmed that they would be holding a further public exhibition in the vicinity of Gatwick, and would be liaising with BAA Gatwick, Laura Moffatt, MP and Crawley Borough Council on suitable venues.

35. Mrs. Sewill advised that there had been total dismay expressed in the local community at the High Court judgment. Local residents had previously welcomed the Government's decision to honour the 1979 legal agreement and not include options for Gatwick in the consultation document, but the High Court judgment had changed all this and confusion had now arisen. It was important, therefore, for the Government to indicate in the revised consultation document a clear view about the role of Gatwick, the legal agreement and the options being put forward for consultation.

36. Members also commented on the need to ensure that the venue of the public exhibition was accessible by all residents in the surrounding communities and felt that the airport was centrally located, although it was recognised that car parking could pose a problem. It was agreed, therefore, that the Honorary Secretary would write to the DfT about suitable venues for the public exhibition and the need for the further consultation exercise to have a clear and concise purpose.

37. Mr. McCall referred to the consultation documents already in the public domain, particularly the Stage 2 and Stage 3 appraisal findings reports, and Appendix F of the consultation document. It was felt that from the options already considered, there were clear indications of what impacts the various options would have on Gatwick and its surrounding communities, particularly in the case of air quality matters. There was a need for members to start appraising themselves of the implications at an early stage.

38. Members discussed the likely date for publishing the second consultation paper and the Committee's programme. It was recognised that there may need to be special meetings of the Sub-Committee and the Consultative Committee arranged to consider the response to the consultation.

#### CAA QUINQUENIAL REVIEW OF BAA LONDON AIRPORTS – FINAL PROPOSALS

39. The Sub-Committee considered a report by the Honorary Secretary on the final proposals of the CAA following the recommendations of the Competition Commission (copy attached to the signed minutes). Members noted that the most controversial aspect of the CAA's original proposals to introduce a 'dual till' approach to the regulatory regime, had not been accepted by the Competition Commission. A continuation of the current 'single till' approach had therefore been recommended. It was also noted that the original proposal to introduce a quality of service 'Q' factor in the pricing framework was now to be pursued in a different manner. Following the recommendations of the Competition Commission, it was now proposed to introduce a rebate system to provide incentives to BAA to ensure high quality user and passenger services and the better enforcement of service level agreements.

40. One particular concern to the members was in respect of the losses from surface access projects being offset by higher airport charges. There was potential conflict of interest between the requirements of the local planning and highway authorities and the airport operator in satisfying the CAA in the provision of surface access projects required in conjunction with certain airport developments. The Sub-Committee therefore felt that greater clarification on how the CAA intended to take this element forward was needed.

41. There were also mixed views about the continuation of the 'single till' approach between the airline industry representatives and other members. It was agreed, therefore, that this would be highlighted in the response to the CAA.

42. As regards the proposed rebate system, Mr. Pixley advised that the introduction of a customer service element in the charging regime was very much supported by the Passenger Services Sub-Committee. There were however anomalies in the reason given by the Competition Commission regarding the exclusion of certain services, for example check-in, as such services were not in the total control of BAA. However the reason given also applied to other services such as baggage delivery performance, flight information and aerodrome delays. It was suggested that this be pointed out to the CAA.

43. Members also had the concern that the final proposals lacked incentives to ensure that when BAA Gatwick met the required standard of service delivery, further improvement/enhancement of the regulated services would continue to be made. Members were therefore disappointed that the rebate system was not a two-way process as there was no ability to reward for higher performance in the delivery of service. Members also hoped that pursuing the targets set for the regulated service areas would not be to the detriment of other key, non-regulated, services.

44. It was agreed that the Honorary Secretary would respond to the CAA consultation taking into account the views of the Sub-Committee.

#### BAA GATWICK AIRPORT SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND LEGAL AGREEMENT

45. Mr. Lockwood updated the meeting on the current position regarding the Sustainable Development Strategy and Legal Agreement. BAA Gatwick would be looking at the strategy, particularly the land-use requirements, as a result in the change in traffic mix at the airport. It was possible that following a review of the existing strategy, BAA Gatwick would need to produce an addendum to the Strategy which would be subject to further consultation with the various stakeholders. It was hoped that the review of the change in the business would be completed by the end of 2003 (or the early part of 2004), although the completion of the review was dependent on the work which may be involved on the extended SERAS consultation process.

46. As regards specific planning applications, Crawley Borough Council's determination of the application for the ground run pen and the replacement of hangar 7, had been delayed as a number of concerns had been raised by Mole Valley District Council regarding the ground run pen. BAA Gatwick was currently looking at the specifications for the development to see if they could be improved upon. A planning application was also to be submitted to Crawley Borough Council with proposals to increase the long stay car-parking

provision to meet demand next summer (mainly due to the change in traffic mix at the airport and the passengers' requirements). A meeting had been arranged between officers of West Sussex County Council and Crawley Borough Council to discuss the proposals. A report would be made to the Consultative Committee in due course. As regards the future of multi-storey car-park 3, Mr. Lockwood reported that BAA hoped to reach an internal decision during February 2003.

47. Mr. Lockwood also confirmed that BAA Gatwick was still committed to the change in modal split. Public transport was currently maintaining its share which was encouraging in view of the difficulties since 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2001, although there had been a 2% shift towards the use of the private car. The company believed that this shift was due to the change in traffic mix hence the need for additional long-stay car-parking.

48. The Transport Strategy was to be reviewed during the current year and BAA Gatwick would be examining the current target of 40% of passengers accessing the airport by public transport. Members referred to the success of the Gatwick direct bus service and asked if an update on the progress made in implementing the Fastway Project could be given at a future meeting of the Consultative Committee.

#### AIRPORT RELATED CAR-PARKING

49. The Sub-Committee received and noted the report BAA Gatwick had received from Surrey County Council on the results of the car-parking survey undertaken in Horley (copy attached to the signed minutes). Members were disappointed that the survey was inconclusive although there was evidence of some minor airport related car-parking taking place in one or two roads in Horley. It was noted however that the survey had been undertaken during February 2002 which was not a particularly busy time of year for the airport. From the information currently available, members felt that it was an issue which Reigate and Banstead Borough Council together with Horley Town Council needed to pursue as most of the car-parking problems appeared to be the result of commuter activity.

#### AIRCRAFT NOISE AND MONITORING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ANMAC)

50. The Sub-Committee received a report by the Vice-Chairman on the meeting of ANMAC held on the 2nd December, 2002 (copy attached to the signed minutes). Mrs. Sewill drew to members' attention the study by Environmental Research and Consultancy Department of the CAA (ERCD) which had suggested that the further reduction in the day-time limits could only be minimal as any larger reduction would not be feasible because a large number of chapter 3 aircraft (mainly Boeing 747s) would be caught. The night-time limit could be reduced only if QC4 departures were banned during the night hours. The study had however recommended a trial of differential limits which was to take place at Gatwick, to assess whether it would be feasible to introduce a differential limits scheme.

51. Mr. Lockwood informed the Sub-Committee that whilst BAA Gatwick wished to help with the ERCD's work, his team needed to look at the resource implications to undertake the work for the trial. Whilst members felt that the trial would be a useful exercise, there was concern that the work of the trial did not impinge upon the work of the

Flight Evaluation Unit and it was essential therefore that priority was given to BAA Gatwick's current work.

52. Mrs. Sewill had pointed out to ANMAC that it was feared that much time would be spent arguing which aircraft should be put into which group. It was felt that if the Government wished to pursue the principle of the polluter pays, then a noise tax on the noisiest aircraft should be levied, paid for by the passenger.

53. It was noted that the Government's consultation on the night noise restrictions would be delayed until later in the year following the extra work for the DfT's Environmental Division caused by the judicial review into SERAS and the European Court of Human Rights night-flights case.

#### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE NOISE AND TRACK MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP (NATMAG)

54. The Sub-Committee received and noted the minutes of the meeting of NATMAG held on 9th December, 2002 (copy attached to the signed minutes).

55. Mrs. Sewill was disappointed that there was still a number of flights on Christmas Day at sensitive times of the day when the ambient noise level was much lower. She referred to a particular flight at 0707 hrs on Christmas morning which was most disturbing and also during morning church services. Whilst appreciating that in today's multi-cultural society people still wished to fly on Christmas Day, it was important that the Scheduling Committee and the airlines were much more sensitive about environmental and community issues on this day. Mr. Lockwood explained that the comments would be forwarded onto the Scheduling Committee, but it was also important for local people who suffered noise intrusion should report particular cases, including on Christmas Day. This would determine the extent of the intrusion.

#### Night Movements Summary

56. The BAA Gatwick circulated at the meeting the night movements summary for summer 2002 and for the first part of the winter season (copies attached to the signed minutes). Members commented on the number of early arrivals and Mr. Lockwood confirmed that this was being referred to Slot Performance Committee for examination.

57. As regards the results of the summer season movements and quota usage, it was important for members to note that the comparison should be made between winter 2000/2001 rather than against 2001/2002 due to the impact of September 11th. Ms. Houston also advised that it was important that members took into consideration the change in aircraft movements due to the current traffic mix at the airport and the impact of the low-cost carriers.

58. Mr. McCall referred to the report into the incident at Luton Airport where a cargo aircraft had not been loaded in the correct fashion. Reference was made to the cargo carriers operating out of Gatwick and members wished to be reassured that there were procedures in place to ensure that aircraft were loaded correctly. It was agreed, therefore,

that the Honorary Secretary would write to the CAA to ask what their procedures were in this regard and what audit processes were in place at the airport.

#### Complaints Analysis

59. BAA Gatwick circulated at the meeting the complaints analysis for the period October to December 2002 (copy attached to the signed minutes). Members congratulated BAA Gatwick on the good response times for answering aircraft noise complaints, particularly since the departure of Richard Hilton whose post still remained vacant.

#### DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT PRESS RELEASE – SINGLE EUROPEAN SKY AGREEMENT

60. The Sub-Committee received and noted the press release issued by the Department for Transport on the agreement reached to create a single European sky (copy attached to the signed minutes).

#### DATE OF NEXT MEETING

61. Reference was made to the request at the last meeting of the Consultative Committee to consider changing the date of the April meeting of the Consultative Committee so that it did not fall in the week of Easter. Members considered this request and agreed that the meeting of the Consultative Committee would be moved to Thursday 10th April, 2003 commencing at 2.00 p.m.

62. As a result of the above change, it was necessary to reschedule the date of General Purposes Sub-Committee. It was agreed, therefore, that the next meeting of the Sub-Committee would take place on Thursday 20th March, 2003 at 10.00 a.m.

#### BAA SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAMME

63. Mrs. Howells informed the Sub-Committee that BAA was undertaking a stakeholders survey as part of its sustainability programme. The survey interviews would be conducted over the forthcoming weeks commencing the week 20th January, 2003. Members of the Consultative Committee would be invited to take part in this survey and Mrs. Howells stressed the importance to obtain constructive feedback during the interview process. Letters would be sent to stakeholders before an interview was arranged. The Consultative Committee would be kept informed of the survey results and these would hopefully be reported at the next meeting of the Sub-Committee.

64. The Chairman also informed members that at the next meeting of the Consultative Committee in January, Mr. Mike Clasper, Deputy Chief Executive, BAA, would attend the meeting to discuss BAA's investment programme, resources, the sustainable development strategy and the future of Gatwick post September 11th.

#### OVERFLIGHT OF THE AONBs

65. Reference was made to the presentation given by Ms. Howell from West Sussex County Council on the overflight of the AONBs. Members emphasised the importance of

this issue in the considering the SERAS options for Gatwick once published and asked whether the presentation paper was yet available. The Honorary Secretary agreed to pursue the matter with the County Council.

CHAIRMAN