

*Subject to confirmation*

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE MANCHESTER AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE held on 28 October 2011 in the JFK Suite, Hilton Hotel, Manchester Airport**

**PRESENT:**

S R Wilkinson – Chairman  
D Stockton – Cheshire East Council  
L Grice – Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council  
J Pantall – Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council  
D Quayle – Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council  
B Sharp – Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council  
M Whetton – Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council  
K Whitmore – Manchester City Council  
S Parish – Warrington Borough Council  
J Thomas – North West Region Chambers of Commerce Council  
A Lang – Northwest Region of CBI  
P Morris – Airline Operators Committee  
P Burns – Heald Green and Long Lane Ratepayers Association  
Ms W Casey – Combined Association of Wythenshawe Tenants  
T Greaves – Knutsford and Mobberley Joint Action Group  
R J Farr – Styal Action Association  
Mrs S Matlow – Passenger Representative  
N Duncan – Which?

**REPRESENTING MANCHESTER AIRPORT PLC:**

J Atkins – Managing Director, MAG Developments  
J Armstrong – Customer Services Director  
J Challis – Community Adviser  
J Twigg – Group Planning Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION:**

C Kearney, Cheshire East Council

**SECRETARIAT:**

M Flynn, Secretary  
D J French, Assistant Secretary

**APOLOGIES:**

A Burns  
S Campbell  
G Davies  
G Walton

## 1 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

- (a) **RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 8 July 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

With reference to Minute 1 (e) the Secretary explained that the bank had agreed to remove their charges and reimburse the Committee's bank account fully for those charges paid to date.

- (b) The Minutes of the Meeting of the Technical Advisory Group held on 7 October 2011 were considered.

With regard to Minute 3 (Runway Refurbishment Programme Update) it was noted that the Technical Advisory Group had been advised that the use of Runway 2 at night was to end on 11 November; however, Airport officers advised the Consultative Committee that the use of Runway 2 would need to be extended and an explanation would be given during the Managing Director's report.

In relation to Minute 4 (NATS Future Business Plan) the view was expressed that any consultation carried out in communities should include attendance by an Airport officer who had sufficient knowledge to advise members of the public on the implications of the proposals; it was noted that the consultation would be led by NATS but the Community Relations team were providing full support to the process and liaising with NATS and would ensure this suggestion was pursued.

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes be received.

- (c) The Minutes of the Meeting of the Airport Users' Advisory Group held on 30 September 2011 were considered.

In relation to Minute 2 (UK Borders Agency), the Committee was advised that the Group remained concerned about queuing times; although the queuing standard of 95% of people through security checks within 25 minutes was achieved, measurements were taken from entry into the immigration hall rather than from the piers. The Committee was advised that this was an issue affecting a number of other large UK Airports and discussions were being held with UKBA to try to address queuing times, including performance monitoring using Bluetooth technology.

Under Minute 6 (Outstanding Issues and Areas of Concern) the Group had recorded its strong preference for the replacement of autowalks as a service to passengers, rather than their removal. It was felt that a service was needed for those who had physical needs that did not require a wheelchair. In response, it was explained that the service to Persons with Reduced Mobility was being reviewed from November and the requirements of people who were semi-ambulant for access to

autowalks would also be taken into consideration. In addition, the Group remained concerned about the steep stairs at Pier C gates 22 – 26 and asked whether any progress on erecting a barrier and additional signage had been made. The Airport officers agreed to check and report further to the Group.

In relation to Minute 3, Customer First, and the possible trial use of small trolleys airside for hand luggage, concern was raised regarding passengers being permitted to carry as cabin bags large items of hand luggage that were difficult to place safely in overhead lockers and inconvenienced other passengers. It was suggested that the Group should consider the Airlines' policies on non hold baggage, and the need for a consistent approach at check in.

With regard to Minute 10, the Airport was congratulated on its innovative policies for reducing carbon footprint and energy saving. A copy of the Report concerning these initiatives would be circulated by the Airport to all members of the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes be received.

(d) Membership and Attendance

There were still issues with non attendance by the Airport Employees' and the Disability representatives. The Committee was advised that the Airport was still investigating an Employees' representative and Disabled Go had confirmed it was unable to take a place on the Committee. It was suggested that a disability representative could be co-opted onto the Users Group.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be received and investigations continue regarding representation from the Airport Employees and a disability representative.

## 2 AIRPORT CITY ENTERPRISE ZONE

John Atkins, Managing Director, Airport Developments, Manchester Airport Group gave an update on Airport City. The initiative had been conceived as a major development of the commercial and business facilities at the Airport and had recently benefited from Government designation as an Enterprise Zone. There were a number of strategic advantages to Airport City including:

- International connections including 190 business destinations;
- Wider regional connections with good surface and ground transport links;
- Available undeveloped land;
- Access to the Manchester regional knowledge base and development of a knowledge capital.

There were to be 14 sites in the Enterprise Zone with the proposed boundaries submitted to the Government in September 2011; all of which were in Greater Manchester. Copies of the presentation would be circulated after the meeting

to enable Members to see the boundaries of the Zone. Government approval was anticipated in November and the Zone was expected to be operational from April 2012. Businesses would receive a rate reduction of £55k each year for five years. Consultation on the approach to planning in the Zone was to be undertaken in local areas over the next 3 – 4 months.

It was intended that Airport City would make a major contribution to the regeneration of Wythenshawe. There were two growth areas identified in the Zone – the Airport and Wythenshawe Hospital; work would be undertaken to identify ways of linking the opportunities created in these areas with the local community, through vehicles such as the Airport Enterprise Academy, which was already a successful initiative. The intention was also to create opportunities for the longer term and less skilled unemployed. The Zone was based on a European model and would take advantage of existing public transport networks around the Airport. The Central zone had existing public transport connections including easy access to the Station but vehicle access would also be included in the whole Zone. The scheme would be compatible with the SEMMMS project.

The Committee was advised that the scheme was based on an economic analysis carried out by KPMG to identify how to bring the greatest number of additional jobs to the local area. The objective was to create new jobs by attracting additional employers to the area. The target was to achieve 7000 extra jobs, and the scheme would be marketed internationally. Over 1000 enquiries had already been received since the Zone was announced.

Councillor Sharp declared a personal interest in this item as a Trafford local Councillor for the Halebarns Ward

**RESOLVED:** That the Presentation be received and copies be circulated to all Members of the Committee.

### **3 RUNWAY 2 SECTION 106 AGREEMENT**

Tim Harrison and Ed Holden, University of Liverpool, briefed the Committee on their Report “A review of the Section 106 Agreement and its Future”. The Airport had commissioned the Report to provide an independent opinion on how the Agreement had worked over the last ten years.

It was noted that an annual monitoring and audit report of the S106 was considered by both TAG and this Committee. However, 2011 had been agreed as a key date for a review of the S106 as it was ten years since the 2<sup>nd</sup> runway had opened. With regard to the review the Agreement provided that in 2011, any of the obligations not entirely performed should be renegotiated in good faith for an alteration of such obligations.

The S106 provided a legal framework between the Airport, Manchester City Council and Cheshire East Council. The review had included wide ranging research including liaison with experts in relation to environmental practice and policy, other Airports and interviewing key stakeholders.

The S106 had had a number of positive impacts including:

- Noise reduction and track information;
- Community Trust Fund;
- Improved transparency;
- Delivery of infrastructure including public transport measures;
- Successful landscape and habitat mitigation plan;
- The Steering Group and sub-committee structure;
- It was now seen as good practice to have a S106 agreement and this practice had been followed by other major airports.

With the benefit of hindsight, areas identified as needing to have been strengthened through more challenging obligations and targets included public transport/surface access obligations, parking and “Kiss and Fly” which reflected levels of car use which were too high. It was now considered that the 7% level relating to night movements was “meaningless”; the Sound Insulation Grant Scheme no longer completely reflected where noise disturbance occurred and the Community Trust Fund, although seen as an important initiative that was held in high regard, was now considered as having too large a radius of eligibility due to a reduction in the areas affected by noise impacts. However, the Airport had led the way through the extent of its habitat and landscape mitigation and land management programmes; through incentivising Airlines to use modern fleets and other noise reduction practices; increased usage of public transport; and an open and transparent approach to Community engagement.

Challenges for the future were wide ranging and included technological developments such as the greater efficiency and reduced noise of the next-generation aircraft; and industry costs eg. rising fuel prices, Air Passenger Duty Levy, and the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. There was a need to take account of new developments including changes within the aviation industry; the increased focus on sustainability; improved noise performance and track keeping; and changes to the planning regime.



In conclusion, it was felt that on balance the S106 Agreement had secured greater levels of environmental mitigation and benefit than would otherwise have happened; and that the S106 process offered the chance to retain local agreement, accountability and consensus. The Independent Report recommended that the opportunity should be taken to review and reconsider the Agreement which would enable the re-establishment of best practice and contribute to achieving more sustainable airport operations.

In discussing the presentation, the following issues were raised:

- The Community Trust Fund had been well received by local communities but the Fund was reducing as income from fines receded. The Fund aimed to provide some compensation for communities who experienced additional inconvenience arising from the second runway but it might be appropriate to now consider other impacts as a basis for eligibility for Trust Fund applications as well as the need for a reduction in the area of benefit;
- Whether it would be possible to allocate any unspent funding in each year’s Noise Insulation budget to the Trust Fund?
- The whole issue of noise should be reconsidered on the basis that

technological improvements to Aircraft may have contributed to reduced noise levels as much as effective track keeping. Possibly noise targets should now be made more demanding as a result, which could also increase income for the CTF;

- The need to provide for effective information flows between the Airport and local communities in future arrangements;
- An expectation that the Airport would do more to reduce the level and impact of night noise
- Any renegotiation of the Agreement must involve local stakeholders fully and the Local Planning Authorities, and take into account changes to the planning framework nationally;
- The spirit of the S106 had ensured local accountability and transparency in the Airport operations and this was to be commended;
- The role of TAG was noted in monitoring the S106 on an annual basis.

The Group Planning Director confirmed that the review of the Agreement would be conducted in the context of the Airport's development of Environmental Policies, transparency and full engagement with stakeholders. It would take into account other changes since the original Agreement was made, such as the advent of Noise Action Plans, the Airport Masterplan and successive Government changes to Aviation policy. It was assumed that many of the current conditions in the Agreement would continue.

Members felt that the important issues raised in the Report and progress with the review of the S106 Agreement should be referred to Technical Advisory Group for detailed consideration. Members were unclear as to how the Group and the Consultative Committee would contribute to the review process and the timescales involved. The Environmental Adviser undertook to clarify the position through Cheshire East Council and advise further.

**RESOLVED:** That

- a) the presentation be received and Tim Harrison and Ed Holden be thanked for their attendance;
- b) the full Review Report from Liverpool University be referred to the next meeting of Technical Advisory Group, together with further advice on the Review process.

#### **4 REVIEW OF GROUND TRANSPORT STRATEGY**

John Twigg, Group Planning Director, tabled a report on Ground Transport Review. He explained that ground transport was one of the four key drivers of airport capacity but the area over which the Airport had incomplete control, as external service delivery and infrastructure was in the hands of others. It was important for ground transport to be quick, easy, safe and convenient, and much had changed since the current plan was agreed in 2007. The majority of journeys to the Airport, by both passengers and airport employees, were by car:

- 18.65 million passengers -
  - 60% use a taxi or get a lift
  - 27% park and fly

- 10% use the train
- 3% use bus and coach
- 18,000 employees overall worked at the Airport site -
  - 81% come by car with 73% driving alone
  - 9% use the bus
  - 4% use the train
  - 4% cycle or walk

These journeys generated 70000 vehicle trips per day which was equal to 1.34 trips for every passenger. Targets for 2015 were to increase rail travel and coach travel to 15% and 10%. Analysis of how people travelled to the Airport from different regions showed higher percentages of people travelling by rail from North Yorkshire and Cumbria, which reflected the good rail links there, whereas only 2% of people travelled to the Airport by rail from Cheshire. Feedback from Focus Groups suggested that rail was unpopular due to various reasons including lack of convenient rail services early in the morning and the requirement for interchange; although parking at the airport was regarded as expensive, drop off by car or taxi was viewed as convenient. There were different issues at different levels, for example at a local level the transport network was fragmented with different services serving individual locations; there were opportunities for this to be addressed through Airport City. At a sub-regional level the links to the City Centre were good but poor to other centres and there were few high quality bus services on corridors where rail was weak.

The Ground Transport Strategy Review had showed there had been good progress made but the rate of improvement had slowed and some European comparators did better, the environment debate was strengthening, the use of the Station would double in the future and improved accessibility was the key to future success. The station was the hub for a wide range of services with 320 daily train movements and 800 daily bus and coach movements; it was the front door to the Airport for 3.5 million people but the check in capacity was little used; for the future there would be integration with Metrolink (scheduled for completion in 2016) and other services, a 4<sup>th</sup> rail platform, increased capacity and access to Airport City. Collaborative working with First Transpennine Express had grown rail use with the service carrying 1.7 million passengers a year. It was essential for medium – large sized regional airports serving a wide catchment area to have good rail services with quality, reliability and frequency being the key to success.

The use of bus transport by employees had increased to 9% from 4% in 1998. This had partly been due to the Wythenshawe Night Link to meet the needs of shift workers.

There were various issues around car parking including providing the right amount and type of space for many different needs, as well as being able to respond to a changing market and changing customer requirements (eg stay and fly); there had been a growth in “valet” and meet and greet products. The Airport site employed 18000 staff across around 250 companies, with over half working shifts and living in Greater Manchester. Many were dependent on cars to transport them to work but using alternate methods of transport would help free up the road network and car park space. This was being encouraged by emphasising flexible choice for travel and a toolkit of options.

The highway network enabled direct access but congestion affected airport users. There were a number of highway improvements through the Highways Agency and local schemes including SEMMMS; by 2020 the transport infrastructure would be almost fully developed. It was noted that the Airport had invested £100m in public transport over a period of years.

For the future, the Airport would amongst a range of priorities seek to improve strategic networks and key corridors through lobbying and influence, secure new bus services on corridors with the greatest potential, promote public transport and develop the station as a public transport hub in its own right – building on Airport City and Metrolink.

During discussion the following issues were raised:

- The rail station cross platform canopy was due to be completed by summer 2012 through a contract let by Network Rail;
- The availability of online check in meant that remote check in facilities were no longer a priority;
- The arrangements made for car parking by staff and the costs involved;
- Once the new Strategy had been approved by the Board, clear information should be available for the public
- That rail improvements involving the Northern Hub and the Ordsall Curve were essential to delivery of future Ground Transport plans.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be received.

## **5 REPORT OF THE MANAGING DIRECTOR**

The Committee received a report from Andrew Harrison, Managing Director, presented by Julie Armstrong, which identified major issues affecting the business, updated Members on the current level of Airport activity and measures being taken to improve service delivery. The following issues were highlighted:

- The runway 1 improvement works would need to be extended due to issues around drainage and lighting being identified; this meant the night use of runway 2 would need to be extended from the current finish date of 11 November to 21 December 2011. A briefing for those affected was being held on 31 October and invitations had been sent out. Members noted that this involved a total of three months' extension from the original deadline in September;
- Improvements to baggage reclaim were still needed and a plan to address these issues was to be developed over winter. Work was underway with baggage handling companies to ensure compliance with Service Level Agreements;
- Capital expenditure had been committed to replace and upgrade Hold Baggage Screening equipment. There were stringent guidelines on this which could be viewed on the Department for Transport website. Members discussed the arrangements for screening freight carried in both passenger and freight only aircraft;

- A new waste contractor had been appointed – MITIE – with a three year contract, with the possibility of a two year extension. Their goal was to significantly increase the recycling rate from all waste streams generated on site and to help achieve this a Material Recycling Facility was to be installed in the near future;
- A number of initiatives had been introduced to improve mobility services including improved Reception Points for Assistance in Terminal 1, the introduction of a slim line six seater buggy in Terminal 2 and Pro-move Slings to move people into aircraft seats without the need to lift people under their arms;
- A security incident had occurred on 21 September in T1 which had necessitated the evacuation of the terminal. The requirement to follow strict security protocols had meant the procedure took 3 hours and 40 minutes to follow;
- Complaints performance was a little worse than target over the period, with car parking and baggage reclaim remaining the greatest causes for dissatisfaction, although complaints about queuing times at the UK border also remained high. The Airport continued to work with UKBA on this matter;
- At the April meeting of the Community Trust Fund, grants to the value of £16,479 were made to 17 community groups.

The monthly traffic statistics for July, August and September were included in the report.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be received.

## **6 COMMUNITY RELATIONS STATISTICAL REPORTING**

Jonathan Challis, Community Adviser, presented the quarterly report on aircraft track and noise monitoring for the period July - September 2011. The Community Strategy Tracker (as reported to the October meeting of the Community Trust Fund) was also circulated. This highlighted that artwork from children regarding Cheshire Gardens of Distinction was now on display in the Terminal 3 baggage reclaim area. During the autumn, children from ten further schools were visiting gardens and their work would be displayed shortly.

The Community Relations pages on the Airport website had been updated and Members were encouraged to view the refreshed information.

The Airport agreed to investigate the reasons for the repeated nighttime noise infringements by a Cathay Pacific Freighter, given that this had occurred consistently three times each month during the quarter.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be received.