

GATWICK AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

GENERAL PURPOSES SUB-COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 26th June, 2008 at Gatwick Airport.

Present: Mr. N. Maltby (Vice-Chairman in the chair)

Mr. Acraman (substitute), Mr. Barclay, Mr. Hobbs, Mrs. Kitchen, Ms. Knox and Mr. Taylor.

Also present:

Dr. R. Olliver – Member, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Mr. L. Hibbs – Officer, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Mr. P. Childs – Capita Symonds

Mr. T. Lockwood – Corporate Responsibility, BAA Gatwick

Mr. R. Norman – Head of Noise and Air Quality, BAA Ltd.

Ms. S. Howells – Corporate Responsibility Manager, BAA Gatwick

Mrs. S. Batchelor – Public Affairs Manager, BAA Gatwick

Mr. F. Evans – Department for Transport

Mrs. R. Howell – Technical Adviser

Mrs. P. Street – Assistant Secretary

Apologies for absence were received from Dr. Godfrey, Mr. Blake and Mr. Roberts.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20TH MARCH, 2008

99. Resolved that the minutes of the Sub-Committee held on 20th March, 2008 be approved and that they be signed by the Chairman.

DRAFT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES – 24TH APRIL, 2008

100. The Sub-Committee noted the draft minutes of the meeting of the Consultative Committee held on 24th April, 2008 (copy attached to the signed minutes).

UK Airport Carbon Dioxide Forecasts

101. Reference was made to minute no. 120 relating to the DfT's published forecasts for UK airport carbon dioxide emissions, in particular the figures quoted for Gatwick. Mr. Barclay highlighted that the minute needed clarification in that the figures quoted did not include the radiative factor. It was agreed that the minute would be amended.

Immigration

102. The Vice-Chairman referred to minute no. 139 and reported that Laura Moffatt M.P. had pursued with the UK Border Agency GATCOM's concerns about the delays passengers experienced at immigration. Mrs. Street informed members that Mrs. Moffatt had forwarded a copy of a letter she had received from the Chief Executive of the UK Border Agency. The Agency had advised that last summer the waiting times to clear passport control at Gatwick exceeded its published maximum queuing time target of 45 minutes for non EU/EEA passengers and 25 minutes on the EU/EEA control. This had been, in part, the result of enhanced security checks undertaken by Border Force Officers but also because of the considerable growth of low cost carriers and a continued rise in the number of passengers arriving at Gatwick. Confirmation was given that the Agency was working very closely with BAA Gatwick to develop a more effective modelling of passenger flows projections to better inform staff resourcing, implementing better

queuing systems, signage and presentation arrangements to speed the throughput of travellers.

103. Mrs. Street was pleased to report that the Agency was currently increasing the number of front line officers available for the control points. An additional 26 officers had already been appointed, some of which were already in post and a further 16 officers would be appointed to join the force during the summer. The re-distribution of flights at Gatwick with some airlines moving from the South Terminal to the North Terminal has also helped in a better balance of traffic and will help reduce the large peaks of passengers who arrived at the South Terminal.

104. Members noted the targets for maximum waiting times but felt that the performance targets needed to be revised downwards with the aim of minimising queuing times and to make them more consistent with the other queuing time targets at the airport, such as security queuing of 5 – 10 minutes.

105. The Sub-Committee also noted that there were now in excess of 150,000 people enrolled on the IRIS recognition system and that this was increasing on a daily basis. However, this was only a very small proportion of passengers travelling through Gatwick and more needed to be done to raise awareness of the benefits of registering to use the system. The Sub-Committee suggested that the Passport Office could give more information when new/renewed passports are issued and registration booths at the airport should be open for longer periods and at times of peak passenger throughput. It was agreed therefore that the Secretariat should respond directly to the UK Border Agency's letter with a copy to Laura Moffatt.

AIR QUALITY

Local Air Quality Monitoring – 2007 Annual Report

106. The Sub-Committee considered a report prepared jointly by Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and BAA Gatwick on the results of the 2007 air pollution monitoring undertaken on and in the vicinity of Gatwick Airport (copy attached to the signed minutes). Mr. Hibbs reported that the annual average air quality standard for nitrogen dioxide was met at the relevant receptors in the vicinity of the airport during 2007, as were the other pollutants under the local authority air quality management regime. Members were pleased to note that nitrogen dioxide concentrations at properties most at risk of breaching the air quality objective was showing a downward trend, but that this was in line with predictions for non-airport nitrogen dioxide pollution at Gatwick and across the south east of England. As regards PM10 concentrations, these were in line with expectations.

107. The Sub-Committee noted with interest the fact that the ozone concentrations to the south west of the airport did not meet the UK air quality standard. Although the airport was not responsible for local ozone pollution, ozone played an important role in the formation of nitrogen dioxide, which was the main pollutant of concern in the vicinity of the airport. Mr. Hibbs advised that Reigate and Banstead Borough Council was examining the long-term ozone trend as it was important to understand nitrogen dioxide concentrations in both the short and longer term. An additional ozone monitor had been installed on the Horley Gardens Estate for 2008 as part of a short term study of ozone concentrations north of the airport. Members noted that the results of this work would be included in the next annual monitoring report.

108. Dr. Olliver advised that the Borough Council welcomed the partnership working with the airport but it remained concerned that the nitrogen dioxide levels across the Horley Gardens Estate were very close to the air quality standard. It was important therefore that the airport continued to find ways of reducing nitrogen dioxide levels

across the airport. He also advised that the Borough Council wished to undertake a feasibility study on the effects of easterly takeoffs on the Horley Gardens estate. The joint financing of continued monitoring was to be reviewed and Mr. Lockwood confirmed that a detailed proposition had been received from the Borough Council and would be the subject of discussions with officers during July.

BAA Gatwick Air Quality Action Plan

109. The Sub-Committee considered a paper by BAA Gatwick giving details of its air quality activities in 2007 (copy attached to the signed minutes). Mr. Norman first explained the new BAA organisation structure in relation to the way in which it managed air quality. He had been appointed as Head of Noise and Air Quality across the BAA group. Mr. Lugano Kapembwa had been appointed Environmental Projects Manager and he would be accountable, amongst other things, for the delivery of the Air Quality Action Plan. Mr. Peter Childs (who had previously worked for BAA as a noise and air quality manager) now worked for consultants Capita Symonds, but would continue to provide BAA Gatwick air quality expertise in the delivery of a number of actions. The Sub-Committee congratulated Mr. Norman on his promotion and wished him every success in his new role.

110. Mr. Norman confirmed that BAA Gatwick had a commitment to managing the air quality impact of its activities on the surrounding communities. He explained that although the air quality action plan was still in a draft format, its targets were being delivered and the plan was being modified as work was completed and new areas of activity identified. Mr. Childs confirmed that air quality was an important issue for BAA Gatwick and there was much communication and involvement amongst a wide range of stakeholders, including local authorities, Gatwick business partners, the Flight Operations Performance Committee (FLOPC) and the Ground Noise Committee. He outlined the key areas progressed over the past year, in particular the investigation into aircraft requirements for power and connection configuration and the provision of fixed electrical ground power (FEGP) and the airside vehicle emissions management strategy.

111. Mr. Childs outlined the results of the investigation into the FEGP. The general level availability was good, often above 99%, and current provision satisfied the current passenger aircraft demand. It had also been identified that the introduction of the B787 aircraft would require Gatwick to provide a third supply to those stands used by those aircraft types. Additional FEGP provision would also be required if the A380 became a regular user of Gatwick.

112. The Sub-Committee was disappointed to note that a survey of attitudes and behaviours of flight crew and ground handlers had been unsuccessful due to insufficient responses being received to draw any conclusions. It was suggested that in terms of the airlines, the survey should only ask a few questions of pilots with the majority of questions being directed to the airlines companies to answer. Mr. Childs noted this suggestion.

113. Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Norman and Mr. Childs were thanked for their informative presentations.

AVIATION AND THE EMISSIONS TRADING SCHEME

114. The Sub-Committee considered a paper by the Technical Adviser providing a summary the proposals for inclusion of aviation in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) and an indication of the scheme's impact on the air transport industry (copy attached to the signed minutes). Members noted that the European Commission had adopted a proposal for legislation to include aviation in the EU ETS but the detail as to how this would be implemented was still the subject of much debate and there was a

meeting in Brussels that day to discuss revisions to the proposals. There was particular sensitivity around the auctioning of allowances.

115. Members also noted that the UK Government felt that there were significant environmental benefits that arose through the use of the Air Passenger Duty (APD) and the now proposed Aviation Duty. Mr. Evans congratulated Mrs. Howell on providing an excellent summary of the current position and confirmed that addressing emissions from aircraft was a global issue and that the Government was also working with the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) to develop a scheme on an international basis.

116. Particular reference was made to the methods of calculating emissions in the UK and it was highlighted that the comparisons and figures given in Appendix B to the report did not include the radiative factor which would reveal a different ranking of the largest emission sources in the UK. Members stressed the need to put the figures and comparisons into context in relation to Gatwick particularly in respect of the scale of the airport's operation by using growth in passenger numbers which would also help provide comparisons year on year. It was agreed therefore that Mrs. Howell would revise the technical note to include clearer and more meaningful comparisons as well as providing an update on developments on the EU ETS for consideration at the next meeting of the Sub-Committee (GATCOM Steering Group). Members also felt it important to link the consideration of this matter with the report being prepared by BAA Gatwick on 'Gatwick and Climate Change' and the longer term trends.

Interim Airport Master Plan – Commitments and Legal Agreement

117. Mr. Lockwood reported that discussions with the local authorities were on-going regarding the development of legal obligations for inclusion in the new legal agreement and in relation to the action plans being developed as part of the interim master plan commitments. He advised that BAA Gatwick had five action plans in the process of production. The draft action plan for air quality was already in the public domain and the draft noise action plan was awaiting guidance from Defra in relation to the requirements of the Environmental Noise Directive.

118. Members enquired about the involvement of GATCOM in the consideration of the content of the action plans as there was a need to keep all stakeholders involved in the process. Mr. Lockwood advised that as part of the consultative phase BAA Gatwick's planned to circulate the outline draft action plans to the Gatwick local authorities particularly as a few of the actions would feature in the discussions on the new legal agreement. Members expressed concern that GATCOM and other key stakeholders would not be able to input to the draft plans at the consultative stage and urged BAA Gatwick to include GATCOM at the same time as the local authorities. Mr. Evans added that in respect of the air noise action plan, Defra's intention was that these action plans would be prepared in consultation with local communities, possibly through airport consultative committees. Mr. Lockwood confirmed that when the draft outline noise action plan was circulated to local authorities he would also bring the document to the attention of GATCOM members.

119. As regards the development of legal obligations, Mr. Lockwood confirmed that BAA Gatwick was meeting regularly with Crawley Borough Council and West Sussex County Council. Mrs. Howell added that the headline topics of the draft obligations had been included in Crawley Borough Council's Draft Supplementary Planning Document considered at the last meeting of GATCOM.

120. Mr. Lockwood agreed to produce a paper on the latest position to the next meeting of GATCOM.

DFT SOUTH CENTRAL FRANCHISE CONSULTATION

121. The Sub-Committee considered a report by the Secretariat giving details of the DfT's consultation on the specification for the new South Central franchise due to commence on 20th September 2009 (copy attached to the signed minutes). The Sub-Committee was asked to consider the proposed draft response to the consultation.

122. Members agreed with the points raised in the proposed draft response but felt that it was important to include greater reference to the proposed redevelopment of Gatwick Station and the extra capacity this project would bring to the network in the Gatwick region. One member referred to the advantages that the re-opening of the Lewes-Uckfield line would bring for passengers wishing to travel from the south coast to the airport and felt that this should be promoted as part of the new franchise. It was agreed that the Secretariat would further consider these points for possible inclusion in the draft response for approval by GATCOM.

OFFICE OF THE RAIL REGULATOR

123. Mrs. Street reported that the Office of the Rail Regulator (ORR) had published for consultation on 6th June, its periodic review of Network Rail's outputs and track and station access charges, including its investment plans for enhancements to the network for the period April 2009 to March 2014. In the ORR's draft determinations, it was proposing a reduction in the spending plans put forward by Network Rail, resulting in a significant shortfall in funding for the Gatwick Station project. On initial examination of the document it appeared that the ORR was proposing an investment of only £9m, Network Rail had put forward an investment of £30m. The ORR's proposal was of grave concern to the Sub-Committee and members confirmed the importance of bringing forward the preferred option for the transport interchange project in terms of meeting future passenger demand (both commuter and air passenger) in the longer term. The Sub-Committee agreed therefore that a response to the ORR should be prepared for consideration at the next meeting of GATCOM. It was suggested that reference should also be made to the DfT's current study into improving the passenger experience as the journey experience of passengers accessing the airport was a key element of that study.

BAA GATWICK – ORGANISATION CHANGES

124. Mr. Lockwood and Ms. Howells presented to the Sub-Committee the Gatwick Leadership Team organisation chart (copy attached to the signed minutes). The areas of responsibilities of the Directors and Heads of departments were explained and it was noted that appointment to a number of positions had yet to be made.

CHAIRMAN'S ANNUAL REVIEW

125. The Sub-Committee noted the draft text of the Chairman's first annual review of the work of GATCOM during his first year as Chairman (copy attached to the signed minutes). It was noted that the published version of the Annual Review would be circulated to all members and nominated substitutes and their organisations, the media, MPs and placed on GATCOM's website.

COMPETITION COMMISSION'S AIRPORTS MARKET INVESTIGATION: EMERGING THINKING – GATCOM RESPONSE

126. The Sub-Committee noted that following consultation with all members and nominated substitutes a response had been sent to the Competition Commission on its

emerging thinking document (copy of response attached to the signed minutes). The Sub-Committee endorsed the response.

CIVIL AVIATION ACT 2006 – IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW POWERS

127. The Sub-Committee considered a report by the Secretariat giving details of a request from the DfT inviting GATCOM to provide advice as to how well the new powers of the Civil Aviation Act were being implemented at Gatwick (copy attached to the signed minutes). Members noted that there were comprehensive procedures in place at the Gatwick to manage the noise impact of the airport's operation on the surrounding communities. However, the Sub-Committee generally agreed that there were matters as set out in the report that GATCOM should highlight to the DfT.

128. Members discussed the suggestion that the DfT be asked to review the current departure noise limits to make them tougher to encourage pilots to fly aircraft in the quietest way possible. Ms. Knox advised that the airlines would not support the implementation of tougher limits as this was not considered to be the most effective means of controlling aircraft noise. Noise monitors only recorded noise events at a certain location and tougher limits could result in greater noise impacts at other locations along the departure routes as well as increased NOX emissions if more power was applied after the noise monitors had been passed. It was believed that the most effective way forward was to ensure that the overall flight procedures encouraged aircraft to be flown in the quietest way possible. It was agreed that this should be reflected in the response to the DfT.

129. In respect of the responsibilities for noise policies at Gatwick, it was clarified that it was the DfT that had the responsibility for the procedures set out in the AIP and that BAA Gatwick had the responsibility to monitor to adherence to those procedures.

130. Mr. Norman advised that in respect of the level of penalties imposed for noise infringements, this was a matter that BAA Gatwick wished to review and would report back to GATCOM at a future date. Reference was made to the fact that penalties only applied to departures noise infringements and it was questioned whether there should be similar penalties for arrivals, for example for non-compliance of CDA. Mr. Barclay advised that this was an issue that the Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign had raised with the DfT and had suggested that consideration be given to the possibility of imposing penalties for non-compliance using an annual average. Mr. Evans advised of problems associated with the achievement of CDA and that the DfT's Aircraft Noise Monitoring Advisory Committee was already looking at the arrivals policy at the request of GATCOM.

BAA GATWICK CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY REPORT 2007

131. The Sub-Committee's views were sought on BAA Gatwick's 2007 Corporate Responsibility Report that had been published on-line on 22nd May, 2008. Ms. Howells advised that this was the first time that the published report was available on-line only. The Secretariat had sought the views of all members of GATCOM and Mrs. Street summarised the feedback that had been received at the meeting. The main points of concern were that, although the web delivery of the report was welcomed, there was a need to communicate to those interested parties who did not have access to the internet or were in an area where Broadband could not be received. It was also suggested that the report should be made available on-line as a single downloadable document as some members found it difficult to follow the overall performance of the company, especially as there was no summary of performance and the achievement of targets. As regards the presentation of the customer service statistics, it was felt that these could be more

meaningful and it was suggested that could be an issue that the PSSC (PAG) should become involved.

132. The Sub-Committee agreed with the overall summary of the feedback and asked BAA Gatwick to take this into account in future publications, particularly in respect of making available a downloadable document and some hard copies.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

133. The Sub-Committee noted that the next meeting would take place on Thursday 18th September, 2008 at 10.00 a.m.

CHAIRMAN