

**ANNUAL MEETING 2019**  
**LIAISON GROUP OF UK AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES (UKACCs)**

**MINUTES OF THE 43<sup>rd</sup> ANNUAL MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 12 & THURSDAY 13 JUNE  
2019 AT INVERNESS AIRPORT**

**ACCs present:**

Aberdeen	Peter Smart
Belfast City	Alan Walker
	Carole Edwards
Birmingham	Colin Flack
Bristol	Barry Hamblin
	Vicky Brice
East Midlands	Barrie Whyman
Edinburgh	Robert Carr
	Janice Hogarth
Gatwick	Tom Crowley
	Paula Street
Glasgow	David Flint
	Donald Grant
Heathrow	Guido Liguori
	Sam Matthews
	Rebecca Cox
Inverness	Pat Hayden (Meeting Chair)
Leeds Bradford	Michael Goodwin
Liverpool John Lennon	Bob Swann
London City	Duncan Alexander
Luton	Martin Routledge
Manchester	Steve Wilkinson
	Mike Flynn
Newcastle	Dorothy Craig
	John Scott
Southampton	David Airey
	Richard Ward
Stansted	Shena Winning
	Frank Evans

**Also present:**

Inverness Airport	Graeme Bell, General Manager (Wednesday)
Atkins	Campbell Hayden (Wednesday)
DfT	Tim May (Thursday)
ICCAN	Rob Light, Head Commissioner (Thursday)
	Sam Hartley, Secretary to the Commission (Thursday)
CAA Consumer Panel	Trisha McAuly (Thursday)

**Apologies:**

Belfast International ACC, Bournemouth ACC, and Southend ACC

## WEDNESDAY 12 JUNE

### **Welcome and introduction**

1. Pat Hayden, Chair of Inverness ACC, gave an introduction to the meeting and welcomed new attendees Tom Crowley (Chair Gatwick), Guido Liguori (Executive Director Heathrow HCEB), Sam Matthews (Head of Communications and Strategy, Heathrow HCEB) and Janice Hogarth (Secretary, Edinburgh).

### **Presentations**

#### **(a) Connectivity to and from the Highlands of Scotland to the world**

##### **Presentation from Graeme Bell, General Manager, Inverness Airport**

2. The presentation outlined the HIAL group of airports; the routes and operators serving Inverness Airport; its role in promoting and maintaining a thriving local community; the pattern of growth in the past five years and the plans for and restrictions to future growth.

#### **(b) How secure is your airport?**

##### **Presentation from Campbell Hayden, Principal Consultant, Atkins**

3. An overview of the work of Atkins in relation to cyber security and cyber resilience at airports was given. The aim of the presentation was to increase delegates' awareness of cyber security risks to airports and of the new cyber security legislation affecting major UK Airports (those handling more than 10 million passengers per annum). The legislation also applied to those airlines individually handling 30% or more passengers at any of those airports.

### **UKACCs Internal Business**

4. Delegates considered a number of matters relating to the internal business of UKACCs, its secretariat support arrangements, its accounts and budget for the ensuing year.

## THURSDAY 13 JUNE – BUSINESS MEETING

### Notes of the annual meeting held on 7 June 2018

5. **APPROVED** - the meeting notes.

### Matters arising

6. There were no matters arising from the last meeting not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

### Aviation Policy Update

#### Presentation from Tim May, DfT, - Aviation Policy Update

7. The aims and objectives of the review of the Aviation Strategy were outlined. These related to airspace modernisation; drones; sustainable growth within an international context; community engagement and the use of community funds; slots and resilience; and noise.

8. As part of the continued engagement on the development of the Aviation Green Paper policy proposals, the DfT had held two Focus Groups, one to consider noise regulation and another to look at mitigation and compensation. The DfT would circulate summaries of the feedback from these groups to ANEG members.

9. The proposed review of noise action plans (NAPs) by the DfT was discussed. Currently NAPs were not enforceable and community groups were concerned that airports were not being held to account if they failed to meet the aims/goals set out in NAPs. There was consensus at the meeting that it would be helpful to have guidance on what an effective NAP looked like. ACCs commented that the CAA produced a table ranking the provision of disabled services at airports such as “good”/”needs improvement”. This had proved very effective by incentivising airports to provide good quality of service. It was suggested that a similar model might be employed for noise action plans. ACCs could play a more active role in monitoring performance and by sharing examples of good practice.

10. The work of the Airspace Strategy Board was discussed. This was chaired by the Minister for Aviation and supported the DfT and the CAA in their role as co-sponsors of airspace modernisation. The Board was comprised of national stakeholders and UKACCs had been invited to participate in the work of the Board. Delegates welcomed the involvement of UKACCs but also questioned whether the Board was too South East centric and the legitimacy of the community groups’ representation on the Board. It was commented that the AEF was a well-established and recognised organisation but little was known about the ACF, its constitution and membership criterion. Delegates asked that the DfT reflect on this and also its guidance to ACCs to ensure legitimacy of community groups, particularly if they were participating in the DfT’s work.

#### **ACTION: TM**

11. It was noted that sub-groups had been set up under the airspace modernisation governance structure, including ACOG (Airspace Change Organisation Group) to which Mark Swann (from the CAA) had been appointed by NATS to chair the group. Delegates raised the following points:

- That the implications of airspace modernisation on planning policies/local plan development needed to be taken into consideration early in the process. Tim May asked that individual ACCs refer to this in their responses to the Aviation Green Paper consultation and include specific examples.

#### **ACTION: All**

- That the new regulations on flying drones within 5km of the end of a runway should be kept under review as it could be possible that this distance may not need to be as great for smaller airports. [The DfT has subsequently provided ACCs with a link to a website showing to an interactive map of all the restriction zones - aerodrome traffic zone (ATZ) plus the 5km by 1km runway additions – at each airport - <https://dronesafe.uk/restrictions/> ]

### Land use planning

12. Concerns were expressed at last year’s meeting about the continuing absence of planning guidance since the loss of PPG24. The paper circulated in advance for this item described the bespoke Noise Local Plan policy developed by Crawley Borough Council which aimed to fill the vacuum. It was suggested that delegates share this example of how to address the absence of Government guidance with their own local planning authority/other local authorities in their area.

13. It was agreed that these issues should be raised as part of the response by UKACCs to the Government's Aviation Green Paper.

**ACTION: PS/FE**

#### **Collective UKACCs response to the Government's aviation green paper**

14. It had been felt by the UKACCs Working Group that, whilst individual ACCs would be writing their own responses to the Green Paper, there was a need to submit a collective response from UKACCs. A draft response had been circulated prior to the meeting. Delegates were asked to raise any queries, suggestions or additions with the Secretariat as soon as possible in order that this could be amended prior to submission. **ACTION: All**

15. The issue of whether to include APD in this response was discussed at length. It was agreed that, as there were so many differing views on APD, it should be highlighted as a contentious issue and left to individual ACCs to report in detail on their own circumstance. The question of how the revenue raised from the tax was spent should be included in the UKACCs collective response, asking that the government be transparent about this and suggesting that the revenue be used for helping combat the challenges of climate change or other green initiatives/research. ACCs noted that revenue from the duty appeared to be allocated to a general fund as opposed to any aviation or environmental specific use. **ACTION: FE/PS**

#### **Independent Commission for Civil Aviation Noise Presentation from Rob Light, Head Commissioner**

16. The presentation summarised the history of the establishment of ICCAN and the challenges that it faced in managing expectations around its role. Its aim was to be future-focused and independent. Activity in the first six months had principally involved listening to stakeholders around the country.

17. ICCAN had issued for comment its Draft Corporate Strategy 2019-21 which contained strategic objectives and its two year work plan. Its key aim is to improve public confidence and trust in the management of aviation noise by building its expertise, credibility and profile across the UK. With regard to ACCs, ICCAN was keen for committees to play a key role in the development of noise management policy at their airports. Delegates were asked to feedback on the strategy to ICCAN by 16 June. **ACTION: All**

18. In response to requests for questions and comments the following issues were raised/clarified:

- ICCAN would continue to take a UK wide approach. The top 10 busiest airports had been allocated to five Commissioners and the team would continue to visit all airports. They would also be happy to attend ACC meetings if invited.
- ICCAN would offer feedback about ACCs they visited. It was recognised that a significant challenge for some ACCs would be giving time to noise without it dominating the agenda, and it may be that noise sub-groups could be a sensible approach.
- ICCAN was asked to consider how ACCs could assist them.
- It was suggested that it would be helpful for ICCAN to review airports' noise management practices, develop indices to enable comparison, and publish a league table. This approach had been used by the CAA in relation to PRM services and had been extremely effective in highlighting problems and encouraging airports to change their practices. ICCAN agreed to consider this.
- Whilst accepting that there were no doubt basic principles that all airports should be observing in managing the noise climate around their airports, delegates were keen to ensure that any guidance that ICCAN issued took into account the differing local circumstances across the UK's airports

#### **DfT guidelines for ACCs Presentation from Tim May, DfT.**

19. Following last year's annual meeting, delegates were asked to submit their feedback to a DfT questionnaire on ACCs' community engagement mechanisms. The presentation summarised the key themes to emerge from the submissions and the DfT's response to each question.

20. A discussion followed on the key issues faced by the ACCs over the past year, and the following points were raised in particular:

- There was felt to be a need for placing greater obligation on local authority members to feedback adequately to their authorities and communities and to assist ACCs in raising their profile among local residents, as this was not routinely being done.
- There was consensus that it would be helpful for the guidelines to be revised to include a steer on how to engage with environmental protest groups. It would also be useful for 'community groups' to be more clearly defined in the guidance, in relation to their constitution and how representative they were of the communities they purported to represent.
- As ACCs were now expected to play a greater role in community engagement it would be desirable for the guidelines to be updated to reflect this, including the input expected of ACCs by the CAA, DfT and ICCAN, and to address the challenges faced by ACCs in relation to the different arrangements at each airport with regard to budget, committee structures and support given to the Chair.

### **CAA Consumer Panel**

#### **Address from Trisha McAuly, CAA Consumer Panel**

21. Last year the main focus of the Panel's work had been complaints handling and dispute resolution. A survey had shown that more than 50% of those questioned were dissatisfied with the resolution of their complaint, and that 60% of those who were entitled to compensation were not aware of it. The Panel had looked into the types of complaints raised, the methods by which they were raised, alternative dispute resolution, and compensation - including the possibility of this being automatic. One problem they had faced was that there was a lack of evidence from airlines regarding their complaints handling and procedures and more information from them was required. This did not appear to be an issue with complaints received by airports about their services and facilities.

22. The CAA Consumer Panel would be responding to the Aviation Green Paper and would reiterate a series of recommendations that they had already made to the DfT. These included requiring more transparency from airlines in relation to complaints, the possibility of an automated compensation system being explored, and suggesting that ADR should be mandatory with one single provider with consumers not being required to pay a fee to use the service. They would be supporting the proposed Passenger Charter in their response, but emphasising that it had to be meaningful in practice - that is, enforceable, transparent, with KPIs, independent governance, a clear statement of legal rights versus good practice, and greater power of sanction for the CAA. They would also be asking for a review of the KPIs and SLAs for Border Force, some of which had remained the same for the past twenty years.

23. The Panel had had early and ongoing involvement in the airline insolvency review and supported the Flight Protection Scheme. In particular, they had stressed the importance of focusing on how to keep aircraft flying and the needs of vulnerable passengers.

24. Trisha outlined the three strategic themes that would be the focus of the CAA Consumer Panel over the next two years: accessibility; quality; and redress. In the next year they would be looking at vulnerability, not just for PRMs or those with hidden disabilities but any passenger who might face a situation in their journey which rendered them vulnerable. They would also be exploring data and digital innovation, including the way in which this was changing the customer experience, how data was used - especially in algorithms - and the quality of data available to enable passengers to make an informed choice particularly in relation to price.

25. Delegates made a number of suggestions for possible areas of focus for the Consumer Panel:

- Looking at the design of aircraft to ensure that the space inside and the layout made them accessible to all passengers
- Investigating problems associated with interlining and whether connections were realistic and operable in practice
- Considering the possibility that ADR should be mandatory for airports as well as airlines
- Exploring how widespread was the practice of cancelling flights for commercial reasons.

26. These points would be highlighted to the Panel.

27. Delegates also asked if there were issues which the Panel felt ACCs should be addressing and suggested that if it would be helpful to the Panel, UKACCs was willing to attend a Panel meeting to explain the role of ACCs in more detail and ways in which ACCs/UKACCs could assist in the Panel's deliberations.

### **Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB)**

#### **Presentation from Sam Matthews, Head of Communications & Strategy**

28. The presentation outlined the committee structures developed by the HCEB in the past year and some of its activities, and the new methods it was using to engage with groups whose voices had been previously unheard. How the HCEB was using social media, in particular Twitter and Facebook, was described, including the effective use of targeted advertising on the latter to reach new groups. Sam offered his assistance to any ACC considering developing a social media presence.

### **Airspace modernisation**

29. Due to rearranged flight schedules resulting from the strike action planned by Inverness ATC, the CAA representatives were unable to attend the meeting. Paula Street advised that the CAA had provided details on progress in relation to the FASI North and FASI South projects. The CAA's update would be circulated to member ACCs.

#### **ACTION: PS**

30. The CAA had introduced a new Account Manager role to the Airspace Regulation team. This was a coordination-based role to address the administrative functions of the airspace change process. It was anticipated that the introduction of the new role would address the increased demand and resource capacity to enable a more swift airspace change process.

31. The UKACCs Secretariat had issued a paper prior to the meeting setting out for approval some guiding principles for ACCs to use when airspace changes were being planned at their airports to assist them in ensuring that they were performing their role in the CAP1616 process as expected by the CAA. The CAA and DfT had worked with the UKACCs Secretariat to develop these. Tim May added that it was possible that, if approved by UKACCs, the DfT may wish to include reference to the principles in an appendix to the DfT Guidelines for ACCs.

32. **APPROVED** – the document 'CAP1616 & the airspace change process: guiding principles for ACCs'.

#### **ACTION: PS to circulate approved version to member ACCs**

### **Passengers with disabilities**

33. A paper summarising the outcome of the CAA's annual monitoring of disability service standards at UK airports in 2018 had been circulated in advance of the meeting and this was discussed. It was agreed that this league table system had been extremely effective in encouraging poorly rated airports to take steps to improve the service they offered. There was concern expressed about the requirement set out by the CAA in the revised CAP1228 for each airport to establish a disability forum to meet twice a year. It was generally felt by most member ACCs that it could be an unnecessary additional forum for those airports rated highly, and it was not clear how such forums would link to the work of ACCs. It was noted that Edinburgh ACC was supportive of the CAA's requirements and of the need for more training to staff providing special assistance services. Some of those present outlined how their airports already had forums and explained how these functioned in practice. A further concern was expressed that the CAA's performance requirement was based on metrics and did not account for the quality of service or the passenger experience.

34. ACCs were encouraged to continue to share examples of good practice outside of the meeting. Belfast City Airport had a series of videos on its website offering guidance to those who would be travelling with a child on the autistic spectrum - <http://www.belfastcityairport.com/At-The-Airport/Passenger-Information/travelling-with-children>

### **Taxi operations and airport related parking in neighbourhoods around airports**

35. This item had been included on the agenda following an enquiry made last year by Newcastle ACC. A paper had been circulated outlining some of the problems associated with taxi drivers waiting for long periods in communities around airports, and airport staff and users parking in residential areas. Delegates shared their experiences, including measures being taken by airports to address this issue.

### **Aviation and health**

36. The UKACCs Working Group had asked that the Secretariat prepare a paper on the key human health issues associated with the environmental impacts of aviation - noise and air quality - and this had been circulated prior to the meeting.

37. Tim May reported that DEFRA had set up a group who were looking at the guidelines published by WHO this year and the research that underpinned them. This exercise would take approximately two years and could result in some recommendations being made to the government. It was noted that the Government study related to environmental noise not just aviation related noise

38. The Chair of London City ACC offered to share a presentation made to his committee recently from two councils who had declared a climate crisis.

**ACTION: DA**

39. It was agreed that the Secretariat should arrange for Public Health England to come and present on this issue at the next annual meeting.

**ACTION: PS**

40. Delegates also highlighted the need to have a better understanding of air quality issues around airports, climate change initiatives at airports and the role of surface access modal choices in addressing environmental impacts.

**ACTION: PS/FE to note for next year's agenda**

### **Membership of the UKACCs Liaison Group**

41. The paper circulated in advance of the meeting detailed the air traffic statistics and passenger throughput at UK airports in 2018. It was noted that no changes were needed to the UKACCs subscription band fees.

42. The number of aircraft movements at Norwich airport were noted and, although the airport's passenger throughput did not meet UKACCs membership criteria, it was felt that Norwich Airport was of regional significance and should be offered membership.

43. **AGREED: that Norwich airport should be approached to join UKACCs.**

**ACTION: PS/FE to write to Norwich ACC**

### **Any other business**

44. This was the last annual meeting that Peter Smart, Chair of Aberdeen ACC who had been involved with UKACCs since 2006, would be attending as he was retiring at the end of 2019. On behalf of UKACCs Pat Hayden and Colin Flack paid tribute to Peter, thanking him for his significant contribution to UKACCs over the years, in particular his role as Chair of the UKACCs Working Group.

### **Venues for future conferences**

45. The 2020 annual meeting would be held in Bristol on 17 and 18 June. Stansted ACC volunteered to host the meeting in 2021, subject to the agreement of the airport.

**Rebecca Cox**  
**UKACCs Secretariat**