

**ANNUAL MEETING 2018**  
**LIAISON GROUP OF UK AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES (UKACCs)**

**MINUTES OF THE 42<sup>ND</sup> ANNUAL MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 6 & THURSDAY 7 JUNE 2018 AT HEATHROW AIRPORT.**

Present:

Aberdeen	-	Dr. Peter Smart
Belfast International	-	Mr. Tom McGrath
Birmingham	-	Mr. Colin Flack (Wednesday 6 June only)
Bristol	-	Mr. Barry Hamblin
	-	Mrs. Vicky Brice
Bournemouth	-	Mr Peter Thorne
East Midlands	-	Mr. Barrie Whyman
Edinburgh	-	Mr. Robert Carr
	-	Mr. Tom Wright
Gatwick	-	Dr. John Godfrey
	-	Mr. Barry Smith
	-	Mrs. Paula Street
Glasgow	-	Mr. David Flint
	-	Mr. Donald Grant (Thursday 7 June only)
Heathrow	-	Prof. Rod Smith (Chair of the meeting)
	-	Ms Rachel Cerfontyne (Wednesday 6 June only)
	-	Mrs. Rebecca Cox
	-	Mr. Martyn Hurst
Inverness	-	Mrs. Pat Hayden
Leeds-Bradford	-	Mr. Michael Goodwin
Liverpool John Lennon	-	Mr. Bob Swann
	-	Mr Mike Jones
London City	-	Mr. Duncan Alexander
Luton	-	Mr Martin Routledge
Manchester	-	Mr. Steve Wilkinson
	-	Mr. Mike Flynn
Newcastle	-	Mrs. Dorothy Craig
	-	Mr. John Scott
Southampton	-	Mr. David Airey
	-	Mr Richard Ward
Stansted	-	Ms Shena Winning
	-	Mr. Frank Evans

Also present:

DfT	-	Mr. Tim May (Thursday 7 June only)
	-	Mrs Sally Stolworthy (Thursday 7 June only)
CAA Consumer Panel	-	Ms Jenny Willott, Chair (Wednesday 6 June only)
CAA	-	Mr. Mark Simmons (Thursday 7 June only)
	-	Ms. Annie Gilbert (Thursday 7 June only)
	-	Mr. James Fremantle (Thursday 7 June only)
Sustainable Aviation	-	Dr Andy Jefferson (Thursday 7 June only)

Apologies:

Belfast City ACC, Doncaster-Sheffield ACC, Glasgow Prestwick ACC and Southend ACC

**WEDNESDAY 6 JUNE 2018**

## **OVERVIEW OF WORK OF CAA CONSUMER PANEL**

1. **Received:** a briefing from Jenny Willott, Chair, outlining the current issues for the CAA Consumer Panel, including:
  - Aviation Strategy – the panel was working with the CAA and the DfT on issues such as Alternative Dispute Resolution, the performance of Border Force, disruptions for passengers that fell between two organisations, baggage reclaim, delays and accessibility.
  - Other issues for the Panel included airline insolvency, services provided to PRMs, especially those with hidden disabilities and other vulnerable passengers.
  - Data collected by the CAA was also being reviewed to determine how useful it was and to what extent it was helpful to passengers – and whether this data was being used effectively.
  - It was also exploring a recent CAA Tracker Survey of 3500 passengers which showed a slow but steady decline in satisfaction levels. Disruptive events were the biggest driver in levels of dissatisfaction.
2. **Noted:** Jenny Willott acknowledged that there were areas of the Panel's activities where ACCs may wish to get involved.
3. **Issue raised:** The reporting of the CAA's flight punctuality statistics needed to be put into context. The difference between the best performing airports and the worst performance airports was between 11 – 20 minutes delay, which given the airspace capacity constraints, runway capacity constraints at some airports and the disruption from industrial action in Europe affecting ATC operations at UK airports, was viewed as reasonable performance.
4. **Agreed:** That, in view of the limited time at the meeting, ACCs were asked to raise issues of interest to their ACC with the Secretariat to take forward with the Panel Chair.

## **HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED PRESENTATIONS**

### **Heathrow Airport now and its expansion plans**

5. **Received:** a presentation from Emma Gilthorpe, Executive Director of Heathrow Expansion.
6. **Noted:** The previous day had seen a Government announcement about the future of Heathrow. In particular that there would be a Parliamentary vote in July and Government consultation in October regarding the slot strategy for Heathrow and the allocation of new slots. Heathrow had already implemented a £10 reduction in domestic flight charges for airlines and had set aside £10m in a route development fund.

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

7. **Received:** a presentation from Rob Gray, Community & Stakeholder Relations Director, on the transition of the HACC into the HCEB.
8. **Received:** an introduction to Rachel Cerfontyne, Chair of the HCEB, who outlined her thoughts about community engagement and the challenges ahead.

## DfT AVIATION POLICY UPDATE

9. **Received:** a [presentation](#) from Tim May, DfT.
10. *Aviation Strategy* – there had been 370 responses to the [call for evidence consultation](#), many of which were from individuals. The top themes raised in responses were noise, air quality and carbon. A Green Paper of proposed policies would be published in the autumn. The DfT was holding a few focus groups over the coming weeks to discuss a range of topics the outcomes of which would be used to develop policy proposals in the Green Paper. UKACCs has been invited to participate in those events.
11. *Expansion of Heathrow* – now that the [NPS](#) had been tabled, there would be a parliamentary vote within 21 sitting days. Heathrow had made several commitments, including support for new services. The DfT would be holding the airport to account on delivering their commitments. New services would ultimately be dictated by the commercial interests of the airlines, so guidelines would be required. The statement of intent was that 15% of new slots would be available for new domestic services. Confirmation was received that the compensation and mitigation requirements would relate specifically to Heathrow.
12. The DfT confirmed that the HCEB had been developed to meet Heathrow's specific requirements and it was not expecting other ACCs to change to the Community Engagement Board model even if their airports were undergoing development.
13. *Capacity* – published alongside the proposed NPS was the Government's policy statement on making [best use of existing runways](#).
14. *Brexit* – the DfT met with their counterparts in Europe the day before and the [slides presented](#) would be forwarded to the UKACCs secretariat for onward circulation to members. A framework would be prepared for future economic partnership with Europe and a White Paper would be published in the next few months.
15. In response to questions, a number of concerns were raised, including:
- The immediate problem of maintaining domestic services to London airports before new capacity is delivered.
  - Ring fenced slots for regional services was welcomed but it was feared that given commercial pressures of airlines whether new domestic routes could be sustained over the long term and the business case justified.
  - ACCs were all struggling with the concept of trying to balance the economic benefits of aviation with the environmental disbenefits. Clearer policy guidance on how this could best be achieved was required from the Government, especially with regard to what is meant by "sustainable aviation". There was a view that this could not be achieved as despite the significant investment and efforts of the industry to reduce noise and carbon, the benefits of those improvements were lost through incremental traffic growth.
  - As PPG24 was no longer in existence, an integrated Government approach on the development of land around airports was required, with clear advice from the Government about what planning authorities should be doing. UKACCs has already raised the need for greater guidance on land use planning and noise with the Ministers for Aviation and Environment as part of its response to the recent consultation on the National Planning Policy Framework.
  - A request for the DfT to host roadshows in the far regions and devolved administrations to gain interest and input to the Green Paper policy proposals. It was noted that the Scottish Government had been invited to participate in the DfT focus groups.

## AIRSPACE AND NOISE

16. **Received:** The Secretariat's paper raising a number of matters for consideration.

17. **Received:** a [presentation](#) from Tim May, DfT on airspace modernisation, noise management and ICCAN.

18. *ICCAN* – the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise was an advisory body that had been set up to try to increase trust in relation to airspace changes and noise data. The appointment of a Head Commissioner would be announced shortly. The DfT would recruit the Secretariat who would be civil servants and ICCAN's offices would be based in Guildford.

19. *Airspace change* – there was now a more transparent process which included a requirement to consult on different route options, as well as routes to provide respite.

20. *Metrics* - new metrics to indicate frequency of overflight had been incorporated into the CAA's new airspace change process [CAP 1616](#).

21. *Airspace modernisation* – without airspace modernisation air traffic delays could rise by 71 times between 2015 and 2030 (a delay of 30 mins for one flight in every three). The roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders were outlined, together with the challenges posed by the airspace overlaps for the South East airports.

22. NATS had produced a feasibility assessment of potential future airspace demands. The findings will be published later in 2018. The DfT, CAA and NATS were developing a national governance structure to oversee airspace modernisation.

23. **Issues raised:**

- New housing developments near airports, including the conversion of offices and commercial buildings to housing, there was a need for Government departments to work together to make it a statutory requirement to provide the correct specification of noise insulation for housing close to airports and for building inspections to certify correct installation. All agreed that this was urgently required, particularly in the light of the Government's consideration of compensation and mitigation policies and the noise contours that will be used to assess eligibility requirements, such as the 51dBA contour. This may also require Government to review the current Building Regulations
- The need for more robust planning policy guidance since the loss of PPG24 to assist planning authorities, developers and airports in determining compensation and mitigation schemes.
- The need to recognise that noise disturbance and air quality was also an issue to be addressed but that surface access (road and rail) and on-airport ground movements also contributed to disturbance and pollution for local residents.
- ACCs suggested that applying a set of standards to airports as the CAA already did for assessing PRM assistance standards should be considered. Such a system relating to noise standards would act as an incentive for airports to aspire to a "very good" rating. No airport would want to be classified as "poor".

24. **Received:** a [presentation](#) from Mark Simmons and Annie Gilbert, CAA on the new airspace design guidance (CAP 1616) and the expected role of the ACCs.

25. **Noted:**

- the new process, CAP1616, consisted of 7 stages with 5 opportunities for engagement
- it was the responsibility of the airspace change sponsor to keep all stakeholders and communities notified of progress, proposals for change and opportunities to input.
- There were many references to engaging with ACCs in the new process, including the ability of an ACC to have a 10 mins slot to speak at the public sessions at stage 5 "Decide".
- All proposals, responses and supporting material will be hosted by the CAA's airspace change portal (under development).
- There had been confusion at a couple of airports where airspace change proposals had already commenced before the new CAP1616 process was issued which had resulted in abortive work at great cost to the airport.

26. **Issues raised:**

- Change sponsors would be judged on the efficacy of their engagement, but this could be problematic in situations where the changes were perceived to have a positive outcome meaning that those people were not responding to consultations. It was unclear how this could be weighted in evaluating the success of the proposals.
- The new process would take around two years to complete. However, the timescales currently were unclear due to delays caused by the unprecedented demand for proposals for change being submitted to the CAA at the current time.
- Options for respite are determined on a case by case basis in consultation with local communities – there is no set model for providing respite as what works well for one airport may not be appropriate for another. It was important that policy was not developed on the basis that one size fits all. It was essential that local circumstances were taken into account.
- Post Implementation Review (PIR) – the evidence gathering will now be undertaken by the change sponsor rather than the CAA for submission to the CAA to decide on whether the airspace change has met its stated objective. Where the outcome is that the sponsor will need to propose a new airspace change in order to achieve the original proposal's objective, the sponsor will be expected to communicate its intentions clearly and quickly to stakeholders.

27. **Outcome:** The Secretariat was willing to develop best practice guidance for ACCs. However, it remained unclear what the CAA expected of an ACC in this process. The Secretariat would take this forward with the CAA and before developing best guidance of ACCs.

## **DfT GUIDELINES FOR ACCS – REVIEW OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MECHANISMS**

28. **Received:** a [presentation](#) from Sally Stolworthy, DfT, on the review of the mechanisms in place at airports to ensure that CAP1616 could be effectively delivered. The DfT's paper posing a number of questions for ACC's to address was also considered.

29. **Noted:** that ACCs were asked to consider what their role was in effective community engagement, how successful they believed they were in fulfilling this role, and whether there should be any changes to the way in which they were structured or operated. The DfT was keen to ensure that its guidance to ACCs provided the right clarity to assist ACCs in fulfilling its functions, including ensuring ACCs had access to the right resource to support their work, as critical friend to the airport as well as an effective channel of communication to the wider community.

30. **Outcomes:** there was general consensus that:

- ACCs were able to deal with issues within their existing structures, particularly as there was flexibility to make changes according to local situations.
- ACCs were only one of many channels of engagement that airports had in place with local communities.
- whilst the CAA's CAP 1616 process cited ACCs in the various consultation stages, ACCs were not the sole focus for consultation and it was emphasised that ACCs were one of many stakeholders to be engaged in the process.
- the number of newly formed, single issue, self-appointed community noise groups, who were not elected and, in some cases, not properly constituted, was of serious concern to ACCs in that those groups appeared to be having a disproportionate influence on government and the regulator. There was concern that some groups may not be fully representative of the communities they purported to represent and they tended to be very South East centric, with a focus on the impacts of major airports and not reflecting the impacts, or those views of communities around regional airports. UKACCs had previously raised the need for the membership of DfT's ANEG to be reviewed to ensure that the community groups' representation was UK wide and not just representation of communities around the London airports.
- A number of suggestions were made, including:
  - Should funding be made available to assist small groups or charities in attending ACC meetings? ACCs were asked to share examples of good practice in relation to this when responding.
  - Could organisations such as the DfT and the CAA pay travelling expenses to those ACC members invited to attend national fora, meetings, events?

- In order to ensure that those attending ACC meetings were fully engaged and used the information that they received at meetings effectively, could the DfT issue a letter jointly with ACCs outlining exactly what was expected of members? Local authorities should also be encouraged to put a reporting process in place for those attending to feedback to their wider communities. The DfT would raise this issue when it next met the LGA's SASIG.
- ACCs were asked to respond to the DfT's review ideally by 6 July, although it was recognised that this did not give time for some ACCs to consult their wider membership at their next meeting cycle.
- UKACCs would produce a collective response based on the response of individual ACCs.

## SUSTAINABLE AVIATION

31. **Received:** a [presentation](#) from Dr Andy Jefferson, an independent consultant working on behalf of Sustainable Aviation.

32. **Noted:** that Sustainable Aviation was a collaborative cross industry body which focused on carbon, noise and air quality and the improvements made by its members and signatories and innovations planned were outlined, in particular:

- *Carbon* – there had been a 16% improvement in fuel efficiency since 2003, due to investment in new aircraft. A great deal of work was being undertaken in relation to the development of sustainable fuels.
- *Noise* – since 1998 the number of passengers flying had increased by 55%, but in the same period there had been a 40% reduction in contour areas and a 27% reduction in the population exposed to noise. The long-term target was to decrease noise by 50% by 2050. The cost to the aerospace industry of reducing aircraft noise by 1dB was in the region of £1 billion.
- *Air Quality* – they are working collaboratively to share best practice on a range of initiatives, including handling agents. Currently exploring scope to reduce emissions during aircraft turnaround and surface access schemes.
- *Sustainable Aviation Community Forum 2017* – a range of issues had been highlighted by participants than were traditionally raised at ACC meetings. Recognising the broad membership of ACCs Sustainable Aviation wished to explore how they could work with ACCs to articulate effectively improvements that need to be made particularly in respect of the new airspace change process. They too were not convinced that there was the right level of clarity around the new process.

33. Sustainable Aviation had published a number of reports, all of which could be found on their website - <http://www.sustainableaviation.co.uk>

34. **Outcome:** The Secretariat would review with Sustainable Aviation how ACCs could help to articulate effectively improvements being made by the industry and raise issues of concern to ACCs.

## SPECIAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES AT UK AIRPORTS

35. **Received:** The Secretariat's paper highlighting a number of points for discussion.

36. **Received:** a [presentation](#) from James Fremantle, CAA, giving an update on the progress made by airports in implementing the hidden disability guidance and an update on the CAA's annual monitoring of PRM service performance at UK airports

### Hidden Disabilities

37. **Noted:**

- guidance for airports on helping passengers with hidden disabilities had been published in November 2016
- most airports had introduced measures such as quiet zones and routes, separate security lanes, increased staff training, methods of identifying those requiring extra assistance at security, improved wayfinding, familiarisation days, accessible videos and booklets giving information on the journey through the airport, hearing loops and policies on ensuring that such passengers never became separated from carers or accompanying persons.

- A [progress report](#) would be published the following week.
- Similar guidance would be published for airlines in the summer.

38. **Issues raised:**

- A number of ACCs reported positively on the use of lanyard/wristband schemes at their airports but there were some areas of concern about the sensitivity needed about operating such a scheme so as not to appear to “label” those in need of assistance. Passengers should be given the option of deciding whether to wear lanyards etc and whether they needed assistance
- It was confirmed that there was no requirement to pre-notify airports for the hidden disability assistance needed by passengers, although some passengers did choose to advise the airport in advance.

### **PRM service performance monitoring**

39. The performance of individual airports would also be published in the summer (July), though the airports themselves had already been made aware of their rankings. The CAA was seeking to generate greater awareness of the need to provide special assistance especially at overseas airports. The UK was generally considered to be an industry leader in helping to improve such services

40. **Issues raised:**

- The lack of pre-notification for PRM services at some airports remained a problem at some smaller airports in terms of the day to day resourcing of the service.
- Some passengers only recognise that they require assistance when at the airport – they find themselves disabled by the airport environment e.g. unexpected long walking distances. It was important to ensure that passengers who had pre-notified received priority.

41. **Agreed:** that the CAA’s annual monitoring was a good example of a regulator bringing about positive change for passengers.

### **BORDER FORCE OPERATIONS**

42. **Received:** The Secretariat’s paper giving an update. The findings and outcomes of the National Audit Office and the House of Commons Home Affairs Committees reports on the implications of Brexit on Border Force operations highlighted the need for more resource.

43. **Issues raised:**

- The e-gate programme was being rolled out across UK airports. There had been some teething problems with the new technology at some airports but there were also a number of positive stories about the improvement in passenger queuing times.
- Passenger queuing times were an issue for many airports and examples of airports supporting the Border Force operation in queue management was highlighted.
- The biggest issue was with families using the gates as children under 12 years could not use them.
- The identity cards used by a few EU countries caused problems because such passengers could not use the e-gates and had to be processed individually by Border Force officers at the desk.
- All ACCs felt that Border Force’s national queue time performance targets were in need of review.
- Overall, ACCs reported positive relationships with the Border Force team.

### **MEMBERSHIP OF THE UKACCS LIAISON GROUP**

44. **Received:** The Secretariat’s report giving details of the CAA’s 2017 traffic figures and the UKACCS membership subscription bands.

45. **Noted:** The CAA's traffic figures for 2017 revealed that growth had been experienced at all UKACCs member airports except for Belfast City which had experienced a decline in throughput by minus 4%.

46. **Agreed:**

- Cardiff, Exeter and Newquay ACCs should be approached again to become a member of UKACCs.
- The Working Group be asked to consider whether there were any cargo only airports, with a significant number of aircraft movements that should be invited to join UKACCs given the fact that aircraft noise and overflight would still be a problem for communities around such airports.

## **VENUES FOR FUTURE CONFERENCES**

47. It was noted that:

- 2019 – would be held in Inverness on 12 and 13 June.
- 2020 – would take place in Bristol.

## **VOTE OF THANKS**

48. A vote of thanks was extended to Rod Smith, former Chair Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee, for hosting the meeting, and to the team at Heathrow Airport for their generous hospitality in hosting the Annual Meeting. Delegates also paid tribute to Rod for the way in which he had led HACC through a significant transition under his Chairmanship and wished him well in his retirement from the Committee. Delegates looked forward to working with Rachel Cerfontyne, the Chair of the new HCEB.

## **RETIREMENT**

49. Best wishes and thanks were also extended to Tom Wright, Secretary Edinburgh ACC and John Godfrey, Chair Gatwick ACC, who would both be retiring from their positions at the end of 2018. Delegates expressed their gratitude and appreciation for all the time that they had devoted to the work of UKACCs over many years. Their outstanding service, advice and friendship would be greatly missed.

**REBECCA COX**  
**UKACCs Secretariat**