

ANNUAL MEETING – LIAISON GROUP OF UK AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES (UKACCs)

NOTE OF THE 41st ANNUAL MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 8TH JUNE 2017 AT GLASGOW AIRPORT

Present:

Aberdeen	-	Dr. Peter Smart
Belfast International	-	Mr. Tom McGrath
Birmingham	-	Mr. Colin Flack
Bristol	-	Mr. Barry Hamblin
	-	Mrs. Vicky Brice
East Midlands	-	Mr. Barrie Whyman
Edinburgh	-	Mr. Alastair O'Neil
	-	Mr. Tom Wright
Gatwick	-	Dr. John Godfrey
	-	Mr. Barry Smith
	-	Mrs. Paula Street
Glasgow	-	Mr. Jack Richmond
Heathrow	-	Prof. Roderick Smith
	-	Mrs. Rebecca Cox
	-	Mr. Martyn Hurst
Inverness	-	Mrs. Pat Hayden
Leeds – Bradford	-	Mr. Michael Goodwin
Liverpool John Lennon	-	Mr. Bob Swann
London City	-	Mr. Duncan Alexander
Manchester	-	Mr. Steve Wilkinson
	-	Mr. Mike Flynn
Newcastle	-	Mrs. Dorothy Craig
	-	Mr. John Scott
Southampton	-	Mr. David Airey
Stansted	-	Mr. Stewart Ashurst
	-	Mr. Frank Evans
Prestwick	-	Mr. Nigel Wallace
DfT	-	Mr. Tim May
CAA	-	Dr. Rebecca Roberts-Hughes, Head of Policy Development
	-	Mr. Nic Stevenson, Principal, Policy Development
	-	Mr. Jon Round, Head of Airspace, Air Traffic Management and Aerodromes
CAA Consumer Panel-		Mr. Keith Richards, Chairman

Apologies:

Belfast City ACC, Bournemouth ACC, Doncaster-Sheffield ACC and Southend ACC

NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING

1. The notes of the last meeting held on 9 June 2016 were received and noted.

AVIATION POLICY UPDATE

2. Tim May, DfT, gave an overview on plans to update aviation policies and the expected priorities for the new Government to take forward. These included the aviation strategy, Brexit,

responses to the consultations on UK airspace policy, the draft national policy statement, drones and next night flights regime for the London airports. Given the General Election, the timing was fluid and dependent upon the election outcome.

UK Airspace Policy

3. Mr May advised that the consultation on UK Airspace Policy closed on 25 May 2017 and the responses were now being analysed. Delegates noted that there was a need to balance the needs of the aviation industry, passengers, businesses and local communities. A number of delegates had attended the DfT's regional consultation events which were very well organised and congratulated the DfT on producing a very user friendly document and commended the approach for future consultations.

4. Whilst delegates welcomed many of the proposals in the consultation, there was concern that the proposed qualifying threshold for the call in facility for the Secretary of State for Transport to intervene on airspace change proposals seemed limited and needed to be revisited.

5. As regards the revised proposals for compensation, the broadening of the criteria to include residents living directly under flight paths in noise insulation schemes was welcomed. However there were no specific proposals for compensation payments for loss of property value where new areas were affected by aircraft overflight.

6. Delegates were not persuaded that the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise as currently proposed was either necessary or viable. Delegates highlighted that it was also important to realise that each airport had different local circumstances and that a "one size fits all approach" should be avoided. What was right for Heathrow was not the same for a regional airport. It was also pointed out that the consultation did not appear to highlight the importance of safety.

Draft National Policy Statement (NPS)

7. Mr May advised that the consultation on the draft NPS also closed on 25 May 2017 and the responses were being analysed. It was noted that the NPS essentially related to the development of Heathrow and it was commented that the term "National Policy Statement" was misleading. Mr May clarified that the term was that as required by the Planning Act.

8. Mr May also advised that Sir Jeremy Sullivan had been appointed to produce a report on how the consultation process was conducted. 20 local events around Heathrow and 12 regional events across the UK had been hosted by the DfT.

9. Delegates were of the view that the NPS should not over focus on Heathrow at the expense of other South East airports. In addition it was important to ensure that there was good regional connectivity particularly for those airports where rail travel was not an efficient or viable option.

Review of Aviation Policy Framework

10. It was noted that there were increasing demands on the Government to update the 2013 Aviation Policy Framework. The Government proposed to consult in 2017/18 on a number of underlying themes to assist policy development. These included consumer experience; impact of new technology; market access; sustainable growth; environmental impacts; competition and regulation and skills.

11. It was also noted that the election had also meant that decisions on a number of consultations e.g. the National Policy Statement and a new London night flights regime could be delayed.

CAA STRATEGIC PLAN 2016-2021 “MAKING AVIATION BETTER: OUR KEY STRATEGIES”

12. Delegates received a paper by the Secretariat giving an overview of the CAA’s Strategic Plan 2016-2021 which was published in April 2016. The key highlights and the CAA’s work streams across a wide range of topics were noted.

CAA AIRSPACE CHANGE PROCESS

13. Rebecca Roberts-Hughes and Nic Stevenson, CAA presented an overview of the CAA’s role in airspace regulation and modernisation and the current consultation on the proposed airspace design process. Delegates also received the Secretariat’s background paper.

14. Ms Roberts-Hughes outlined the stakeholder engagement arrangements and consultation arrangements on airspace design principles. The consultation would close on 30 June and it was hoped that the new process could be introduced in the Autumn. This did not however prevent airspace change sponsors from proceeding with developing ideas and options in the meantime as the expectation was that the principles of the draft guidance would be observed in the process.

15. She also advised that the CAA would welcome ACCs’ specific views on two aspects of the new guidance – the questions that might be used to structure the conversation at the Define Stage and the engagement evidence the CAA needed to validate for a sponsor to pass the Gateway.

16. Delegates welcomed the improved transparency of the new process proposed by the CAA and the enhanced role proposed for ACCs. The CAA was invited to engage further with UKACCs to help develop an efficient and prescribed process. The potential role for ACCs in helping to ensure the airspace change sponsor had the evidence needed for submission to the CAA at the gateway sign off was specifically highlighted.

17. The detail of the draft Airspace Design Guidance was discussed and the need for issues such as the terrain under flight paths, centres of population, ambient noise levels and other impacts to be taken into account as part of the process. The cost and resource needed to undertake the process was an issue of concern to delegates particularly as the scale of the process and the length of time it would take to complete the process may not be appropriate for smaller airports. Delegates emphasised that a “one size fits all approach” should not be adopted and that there was a need to tailor the process to suit local circumstances.

18. Delegates also advised that ACCs would welcome further clarity on the various tier categories to assist understanding about the scope of each Tier.

19. It was agreed that:

- UKACCs should submit a collective response to the CAA’s consultation. Delegates were asked to submit comments to the Secretariat by 20 June for inclusion in the preparation of the draft response;
- the CAA should be invited to regularly attend the UKACCs Annual Meeting.

EDINBURGH AIRPORT LIMITED’S AIRSPACE CHANGE CONSULTATION PROCESS

20. Gordon Robertson, Director of Communications, Edinburgh Airport Limited gave a presentation on Edinburgh Airport’s approach to its recent consultation and engagement on proposed changes to airspace around the airport. He explained that a two staged consultation process was used. The initial consultation took place between June and September 2016 and the second stage consultation took place between January and April 2017. The whole airspace change process was expected to conclude in April 2019 with the CAA’s Post Implementation Review.

21. Mr Robertson advised that to help avoid the potential for judicial review the airport had put in place a comprehensive, transparent and legally compliant consultation process which showed all the options that had been considered and how feedback from the initial consultation had been taken into account in the stage two consultation proposals. In planning the consultation the airport had used

experts to advise on the form of consultation, sought views of the Edinburgh ACC and advice had also been sought from the Consultation Institute.

22. It was noted that a wide variety of means to reach out and engage with a wide range of communities and interested parties were used such as television advertisements, bill board posters, and radio coverage as well as setting up a dedicated website and on-line response facility . The airport wrote to 643,655 households and to over 900 stakeholders. Hard copies of the consultation material were circulated to all delegates. It was explained that there was a careful balance to be struck between making the proposals easy for the lay person to understand and comment upon and over simplifying the proposed changes and their impacts.

23. Delegates noted that the consultation exercise had gone over and beyond the requirements of the CAA's draft airspace design guidance given the sensitivity of the proposals and the concerns and criticisms of local communities. The consultation exercise was extremely costly but had only resulted in 3% response rate from impacted communities. This was an area of concern to delegates from smaller airports.

24. Mr Robertson was thanked for his informative presentation which had given delegates an insight to what was required and lessons learned which could be shared with their respective airports.

ACC ENGAGEMENT WITH WIDER COMMUNITIES AROUND AIRPORTS

25. The Secretariat's paper reporting on new fora set up by the DfT and the CAA was considered.

26. The concerns raised by community groups at the national fora about ACCs not being representative of community groups and that the membership of ACCs rarely changed was discussed. Delegates did not accept the criticisms that had been raised and highlighted the fact that ACCs operated in accordance with the DfT Guidelines and were required to have a balance of interests represented on the ACC from across a wide range of interests, which included representation from local authorities/communities.

27. Delegates confirmed that they had community group representation on their ACC as well as local authority elected representatives. It was emphasised that keeping the membership of ACCs to a manageable size with a balance of interests to ensure constructive debate on a wide range of matters was important. Whilst noise, overflight and environmental impacts were regular topics of debate, they were not the only topics within the remit of ACCs. ACCs were also alive to the concerns of and impact on communities from areas beyond the membership of the ACC.

28. Delegates gave detailed consideration to the criticisms and had the previous day discussed the membership of ACCs, their terms of reference and ways of working (the key points raised in that discussion are appended to these notes). In response to the criticisms raised delegates emphasised:

- the difficulties of increasing representation on the ACC to community groups particularly as many were understood to be self-appointed (some only involving a handful of residents), lacked legitimacy and were pressure groups. Local community groups had the option of asking their local authority to represent their interests at an ACC or to work collectively with other community group representatives where they had a seat on an ACC.
- the membership of their ACC was reviewed on a regular basis.
- community groups had in recent years enhanced their profile and engagement opportunities at both the local and national level and there was concern that their criticism was undermining the work and role of ACCs.

29. Mr May assured delegates that the Government valued the work and balanced views of ACCs and recognised the success of the coordinated approach facilitated by UKACCs. Delegates

believed nonetheless that there was a need for UKACCs to raise its profile and that of the work of ACCs with Government officials, particularly the new Permanent Secretary and the new Minister for Aviation. It was agreed therefore that the UKACCs Working Group would consider arrangements for a delegation to the new Minister.

30. Delegates also suggested that the DfT and the CAA attend meetings of ACCs particularly outside the South East as appropriate and highlighted the added value if ACCs were involved upstream in the development of projects and consultations.

31. The need for ACCs to attend the CAA's Community Discussion Forum was emphasised. However some delegates pointed out that as some ACCs did not have any budget and relied on the goodwill of airports to fund their travel (from great distances across the UK) there needed to be value in ACCs attending the meeting in London. Some delegates also pointed out that the invitation to attend the CAA's Discussion Forum had not been received. The Secretariat would forward the up-to-date contacts list to the CAA.

32. Delegates confirmed that they would continue to review their ways of working.

PRM SERVICES AT UK AIRPORTS

CAA PRM service performance monitoring

33. Delegates considered the Secretariat's paper and the CAA's update on its PRM service monitoring at UK airports. At last year's meeting, the CAA had reported on the results of the CAA's first year's (2015) monitoring of PRM services standards at UK airports and the areas where improvements were needed. It was noted that the CAA's report on the 2016 monitoring results was expected to be published in July 2017. The CAA had worked with airports throughout the year, providing support where appropriate and had kept relevant staff updated on how their airports were performing against quality standards framework. It was noted that this year airports would be rated as "very good", "good" or "poor".

34. A number of delegates were pleased to confirm that their airports had responded positively to the CAA's monitoring results.

35. The Secretariat would keep ACCs informed as to when the CAA had issued the results of the 2016 monitoring.

Making Air Travel more accessible for Passengers with Hidden Disabilities

36. The Secretariat's paper setting out the key requirements of the CAA's recent guidance (issued in December 2016), for airports in providing assistance to passengers with hidden disabilities was considered. It was noted that the CAA had written to airports asking them to provide information on what they have done since the guidance was published. Delegates also acknowledged that this was a sensitive issue and that some passengers might not wish to declare a disability.

37. Some delegates had concerns about the use of the hidden disabilities lanyard. It was emphasised that the lanyard service being introduced at airports was entirely voluntary for such passengers and that experience to date was that it had been well received by passengers.

38. The Secretariat would keep ACCs informed as to when the CAA had issued its report on airports' implementation of the hidden disabilities guidance.

CAA REVIEW OF ISSUES AFFECTING A PASSENGER'S ACCESS TO UK AIRPORTS

39. The Secretariat's paper summarising the outcome of the review conducted by the CAA in 2016 on issues affecting passengers' access to airports was considered. Delegates noted the key

outcomes of the CAA's review and that it did not extend to rail as it had its own regulatory framework.

40. Delegates were pleased to report that their airports had reviewed their surface access arrangements but pointed out that in a number of cases transport services were provided by third parties which might mean that the airport's influence was limited.

CAA CONSUMER PANEL

41. Keith Richards, Chairman CAA Consumer Panel, outlined the work of the Panel over the five years of his tenure. It was noted that Mr Richards was in his last year of office.

42. Mr Richards explained that the Panel had sought to act as a critical friend to the CAA. The Panel's work had been wide ranging including the provision of information to passengers; consumer research; PRMs; and disruption/network resilience. The key success of the Panel's work to date was the establishment of consumer research, review of the ATOL scheme, the setting up of the alternative dispute resolution system for unresolved passenger complaints, on time departures, managing disruption and resilience and the passenger tracker survey. Delegates also noted that the Panel had sought to benchmark itself against other consumer panels.

43. The Panel's priorities for the next 12-18 months were:

- reviewing the CAA's information duties to ensure that information was issued at the right time and fit for purpose
- ensuring the CAA's priorities for PRMs was maintained
- addressing vulnerability of passengers and how the needs of such passengers are addressed by the industry
- reviewing the price controls regulation
- regulatory independence of the CAA.

44. Mr Richards was thanked for his update and it was hoped that his successor would engage with UKACCs and consult at an early stage of policy development.

UK BORDER FORCE AND ACC ENGAGEMENT

45. At last year's meeting, ACCs had been encouraged to develop close and constructive relationships with the local Border Force officials. The Secretariat's paper reminding delegates of the issues was considered.

46. Delegates were pleased to report that progress had been made at their airports and relationships were being developed. It was noted that the terms of engagement depended upon local circumstances and that some airports had more direct engagement than others.

47. The issue of Border Force staff resource matching passenger growth was a concern for some airports. The installation of E-gates helped to improve passenger queue times. It was also noted that some airports used social media, e.g. twitter to help inform passengers of queue times.

BREXIT: THE IMPLICATIONS FOR AIRPORTS AND THE AVIATION INDUSTRY

48. Consideration was given to the Secretariat's paper which outlined a number of possible implications for the aviation industry and passenger rights arising from Brexit.

49. Delegates registered a number of concerns and there were many points that needed clarification particularly in respect of the ICAO and EASA obligations. It was agreed that the UKACCs Working Group would consider further implications for airports as details became clearer.

50. Mr May advised that the aviation industry had already been very active in making representations to Ministers.

AIR PASSENGER DUTY IN SCOTLAND

51. Dr Peter Smart, Chairman Aberdeen ACC, updated delegates on the future of APD in Scotland. He advised that the Scotland Act which transferred the APD powers to the Scottish Government would take effect on 1 April 2018. It was proposed to replace APD with a new airport departure tax (ADT) in Scotland. UK APD would stay in place until the Scottish Government introduced its new rates.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE UKACCS LIAISON GROUP

52. The Secretariat's paper giving details of the CAA's air traffic statistics at UKACCs airports for 2016 and details of those airports which fell within UKACCs' membership admission criteria were noted.

VENUES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

53. Offers to host future Annual Meeting had been received as follows:

- 2018 – Heathrow – 6 & 7 June 2018
- 2019 – Inverness

VOTES OF THANKS

54. A vote of thanks was extended to Jack Richmond, Chairman of Glasgow Airport Consultative Committee, for hosting the meeting, and to the team at Glasgow Airport for their generous hospitality in hosting this year's Annual Meeting.

RETIREMENT

55. Best wishes and thanks were also extended to Jack Richmond, Chairman Glasgow ACC, Stewart Ashurst, Chairman Stansted ACC and Alastair O'Neil, Chairman Edinburgh ACC on their retirement from UKACCs. Delegates expressed their gratitude and appreciation for all the time that they had devoted to the work of UKACCs over many years, particularly Jack Richmond who had been a member of UKACCs since it was first established in 1977. Their outstanding service, advice and friendship would be greatly missed.

Paula Street
UKACCS SECRETARIAT

KEY POINTS FROM THE DISCUSSION SESSION ON WEDNESDAY 7TH JUNE

ACC MEMBERSHIP, TERMS OF REFERENCE AND WAYS OF WORKING

- Delegates discussed the way in which they reviewed their membership, terms of reference and working arrangements and the requirements of the DfT's guidelines for airport consultative committees.
- It was acknowledged that all ACCs operated in slightly different ways to reflect local circumstances – a one size fits all approach was not appropriate.
- ACCs confirmed that their membership was reviewed regularly and in most cases local authority representation changed the most frequently as a result of local elections. Local authority members were the elected representatives of the wider communities around airports.
- All member ACCs had community groups' representation on their committees but delegates recognised the need to ensure a balance of representation across a broad range of interests on their ACC in accordance with the guidelines on the constitution of ACCs. Applications for membership from community groups some 40 miles from the airport were often received but refused and instead advised to work through their local authority representatives.
- Some ACCs had a policy of reviewing membership in the event of non-attendance of members at meetings.
- Many ACCs already had large memberships and there was need to keep the size of the committee manageable to remain constructive, effective and of value to their airports.