23. WELCOME, CHAIRMAN, INTRODUCTIONS AND APOLOGIES - 5 MINS

The Chairman welcomed Members of the Committee and representatives from the Airport Company. All those in attendance were invited to introduce themselves to the meeting.

24. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING - 5 MINS

The minutes of the meeting of the Airport Consultative Committee, held on 17 February 2016, were submitted.

RESOLVED
That the Minutes be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

Mrs R Tyler, Passenger Representative (Vice-Chairman), should be recorded as in attendance.
The attendance for Hodge Hill Housing Liaison Board, should be recorded as Mrs E Tarpey

Item 5 – COO’s Review/Activities report, Discussion points, page 9, Mr Ellis’ question regarding scheduled night time closures should be amended to read as follows:
‘Mr Ellis explained that, had he been made aware of this, he could have advised the local community accordingly.’

Item 9 – Health Forum Update, page 13, should be amended to read as follows:
‘Mrs Tyler detailed how the previous evidence concerning PM2.5’s was still not relevant for the Airport.’

Matters Arising

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) explained the query raised at the last meeting regarding the potential of using a lighting system had been flagged up with the car park providers, National Car Parks (NCP), and was being investigated.
The Airport Company (David Winstanley) presented the Airport Activities report for the period January to March 2016. Several elements from the report were then highlighted to the Committee on the following topics:

- Passengers
- Aircraft Movements
- Flight Punctuality
- Aviation Development
- Marketing
- Commercial Development
- Passenger Services
- Operations
- Planning, Development and Transportation

**Discussion points:**

Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr D Ellis) highlighted the introduction of Airbus A380 operations and detailed the feedback from residents in Balsall Common that these flights were quieter than anticipated. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) explained this reflected the investment aircraft developers had made in improved technology to reduce noise. It was confirmed the Airport Company could share the noise levels recorded for the Airbus 380, for the ACC’s consideration.

Barston Parish Council (Cllr R Lyon) highlighted the request from the Parish Council, for a portable noise monitor to be deployed in Barston during July/August this year. The Committee agreed for the request for noise monitoring to be taken forward by the Airport Company (Kirstin Kane).

Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council (Cllr D Sandells) noted that the ACC had previously received updates regarding the volume of complaints regarding baggage handling. The Airport Company confirmed this was information that could be shared with the ACC.

Passengers Representative and Vice-Chairman (Mrs R Tyler) explained how the Passenger Services and Surface Transport Working Group had previously looked at passenger complaints, which had been broken down by type and had included baggage handling. Mrs Tyler detailed how they wished to re-introduce this monitoring, in a slightly different form and noted these matters could be considered as part of the Passenger Services item, scheduled later on the agenda.

Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council (Cllr D Sandells) highlighted the issue of safety monitoring and requested confirmation that incidents and ‘near misses’ weren’t the only matters reported. The Airport Company (David
Winstanley) explained how they adopted an open and transparent approach, to ensure all safety concerns were highlighted. He detailed how there were robust reporting processes in place, where any concerns were raised with him, as well as reported to the Operational Safety Review Group and the Strategic Safety Review Group. It was also confirmed that any issues were also reported to the Airport Company’s Audit Committee.

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) explained how they were still bedding down the new Customer Relationship Management system – he noted this gave the ACC the opportunity to analyse issues across a range of customer indicators. He requested for the ACC to identify the performance measures they would like to consider at future meetings, as part of the Passenger Services item.

Barston Parish Council (Cllr R Lyon) noted the travel information area provided within the Airport and queried whether a greater emphasis could be placed upon highlighting attractions across the local region. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) detailed how they did have some travel information facilities for in-bound flights. As part of this, he acknowledged there was a need to target more non-charter passengers as well. He detailed how there were two actions the Airport Company could consider undertaking – highlighting more attractions across the local region within the in-bound flights area, as well as placing more emphasis upon promoting the range of flights and services available at the Airport. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) confirmed this feedback could be passed onto the Trade Team.

**RESOLVED**

(i) That the contents of the Airport Activities report for the period January to March 2016 be noted.

**26. SUSTAINABILITY REPORT - 15 MINS**

The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) presented the Sustainability Report for the period January to March 2016. The contents of the report, on the following topics, were taken as read:

- Sustainability Update
- Noise Violations
- Night Flying Policy
- Engine Ground Running
- Air Traffic
- Aircraft Activity Complaints
- Air Quality
- Waste (Recycled)
- Energy

Discussion points:
Barston Parish Council (Cllr R Lyon) highlighted the Sound Insulation Scheme and requested clarification regarding the criteria for properties to be included within the scheme and the areas covered. The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) confirmed that qualification for the scheme was based upon 63 dB noise levels, which was identified according to Government guidance. He also detailed how the areas included within the scheme were based upon noise contours identified in 2002. It was emphasised that, within recent years, the noise impact had declined, due to a reduced volume of flights and changes in the type of aircraft used; however, the Airport Company still insulated properties within the 63dB contour as it stood in 2002, despite it having shrunk since then.

Marston Green Residents Association (Mr J Fox) also raised the matter of the Sound Insulation Scheme. He expressed concern that residents living in proximity to the Airport site were impacted by engine round running, but were not eligible to have their properties upgraded. The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) confirmed that eligibility for the works was based on aircraft flight noise. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) confirmed they would identify whether there was any potential to review the existing vortex protection scheme. He explained he would raise this issue with the relevant Officer, Kirstin Kane. It was emphasised that the existing Sound Insulation Scheme went beyond the previously agreed minimum levels.

Catherine De Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) queried whether the introduction of Airbus A380 operations was expected to result in increased vortex strikes. The Airport Company explained how the A380 flights were not anticipated to increase the volume of strikes and it was noted that mitigation was built into the existing designs used.

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) explained how the transition from Flight School to ‘The Learning Hub’ was now complete. He detailed the work undertaken in partnership with King Edward’s School in Birmingham and explained how they were looking to engage further Schools and Colleges.

Passengers Representative and Vice-Chairman (Mrs R Tyler) thanked the Airport Company for the invitation to the opening of ‘The Learning Hub.’ She congratulated Andy Holding and his team on the opening of the Hub and emphasised the volume of work undertaken.

**RESOLVED**
That the contents of the report be noted.

27. **MATTER ARISING - ACTIVITY AND SUSTAINABILITY REPORTS - 15 MINS**

Balsall Parish Council (Cllr M Tattum) submitted the following questions prior to the meeting:

*Sustainability Update/Environment/Airspace Change*  
Please would you explain to the meeting what Noise Abatement Procedures actually are.
How will Noise Abatement Procedures reduce the impact of departing aircraft on communities near to the flight paths and how will this be measured?

What is the time scale for trials of Noise Abatement Procedures?

The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) provided a response to these issues under Agenda item 5, as part of the Sustainability report. Details were also provided within the Sustainability Report, under the Airspace Change Update.

5.1 Air Traffic/Runway usage Statistics
3rd quarter 2015 runway 33 = 66%, runway 15 = 44%
What are the correct percentages?

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) confirmed the correct figures were R33 56% and R15 44%

28. UPDATE ON RUNWAY 15 AIRSPACE CHANGE PROCESS - 10 MINS

The Chairman (Colin Flack) detailed how a small group of Airport Company and ACC representatives visited the CAA to discuss the Airspace Change Process trial. He explained the feedback from the CAA was that the meeting had been very amiable and constructive. The Chairman detailed how there were interesting challenges stemming from the piece of work and emphasised that all parties were looking to identify a successful conclusion.

The Airport Company (David Winstanley) agreed it had been a constructive meeting with the CAA and welcomed the joined up approach from the Airport Company and ACC representatives. He emphasised that, at the time the CAA recommended that a trial be conducted, the Airport Company was not in favour with this decision. However, it was acknowledged the CAA had the authority to issue such directives and the Airport Company was looking to fully cooperate in this piece of work.

The Airport Company (David Winstanley) detailed that, as part of the trial, the following factors needed to be considered – what measures were going to be identified and considered, what success was going to look like and how open communications with the local community would be maintained.

The Airport Company highlighted how previous CAA evidence indicated there was no discernible difference between Option 5 and Option 6 in Barston – as a consequence, it was necessary to assess factors such as perceived annoyance. It was explained that, as a result, the Airport Company was going to have to liaise with the local community to agree ways of identifying and monitoring this.

The Airport Company detailed how they would draft a response to the CAA’s request for a trail and look to share this with the appropriate local community representatives.
The Chairman (Colin Flack) confirmed the local community representatives would have the opportunity to propose any changes to the draft response to the CAA.

Barston Parish Council (Cllr R Lyon) queried whether perceived annoyance was considered in the previous trial of the two options for Runway 15. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) confirmed perceived annoyance was not considered as a material factor during the previous trial. He detailed that, to measure perceived annoyance they needed to consider various factors, such as time of day and frequency. He emphasised that the Airport Company, the local community and the CAA needed to liaise to agree the basis of the new trial. David Winstanley confirmed he believed they were some time away from identifying the necessary trial data to be used.

Smith’s Wood Parish Council (Cllr J Wilson) queried why Balsall Common and Barston were the only areas being considered as part of the new trial. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) explained how the communities concerned had been identified by the CAA as being affected by the Airspace Change Proposals for Runway 15. It was explained that the communities to the North of the Airport would be included in a future Airspace Change Process. The Airport Company confirmed the learning from the Runway 15 process would be used to inform any trials conducted in the North.

The Airport Company (David Winstanley) thanked the communities concerned for the way they had conducted themselves during this whole process. It was noted that information concerning the Airport Change Process had been leaked, leading to coverage in the local press and the communities concerned had declined to engage in or respond to this.

**RESOLVED**
That the Update on the Runway 15 Airspace Change Process be noted.

**29. RUNWAY 33 AIRSPACE CHANGE PROCESS - 15 MINS**

The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) conducted a presentation on the Runway 33 Airspace Change Process and the following issues were highlighted:

- The National Air Traffic Services (NATS) VOR Rationalisation Project meant the majority of the VORs that Birmingham Airport relied upon for its departure routes would be removed by 2018.
- To ensure Birmingham Airport had Standard Instrument Departure Routes (SIDs) following the withdrawal of the VORs it was necessary to implement RNAV routes.
- The Prestwick Lower Airspace Systemisation (PLAS) project was also taking place. This project was led by NATS en-route and aimed to bring efficiencies to the wider airspace network.
- The project aimed to provide an additional 5-10% overall network capacity by 2025. To achieve this, Birmingham Airports Northerly SIDs from runway 33 would be required to terminate at a defined point.
The areas affected were highlighted and the Airport Company explained their intention to set up an Airspace Change Focus Group. The Airport Company detailed how they would contact the various communities directly to invite them to sit on the Group.

An indicative timetable was highlighted – the Airport Company was aiming to start developing proposals from May-July 2016 onwards and, eventually, it was intended for a formal proposal to be submitted by April 2017.

Discussion points:

Balsall Common Village Residents Association (David Ellis) highlighted some of the issues encountered with the initial Runway 15 trial process and noted this should be used to inform the arrangement for the Runway 33 Airspace Change Process. He emphasised the need for any proposals and consultation to take into account both theory and local circumstances on the ground. The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) confirmed any design works and proposals identified would be subject to engagement with the relevant community focus groups.

Balsall Common Village Residents Association (David Ellis) noted the proposals to set up an Airspace Change Focus Group and expressed concern at the volume of areas it was intended this would cover. The Airport Company (Andy Holding) confirmed they would look to identify whether representatives could cover a range of areas, to ensure the Group was workable. It was emphasised that, whilst some consolidation might be attempted, the Airport Company would ensure no areas were left out of this piece of work.

The Airport Company (Tom Redfern) detailed how it was anticipated the existing regulatory guidance might change during the Airspace Change Process. As a consequence, it was explained that any trial or work undertaken would be based upon the current regulatory guidance at that time.

RESOLVED
That the update on the Runway 33 Airspace Change Process be noted.

A representative from the CAA also conducted a presentation regarding a consultation on the airspace change decision-making process. During the presentation, the following topics were highlighted:

- How airspace works and the roles of those involved.
- The proposed process for the Airspace Change Process consultation.
- The consultation opened on 15 March and would close on 15 June 2016. Following this, the CAA would produce a consultation response document detailing the intended way forward.
- The CAA intended to provide details of how they proposed to finance the administrative costs of the process in their November charging scheme consultation.
- The CAA planned to consult on a revised version of CAP 725. They also intended to apply any new charging scheme from the 2017 financial year, as well as focus upon implementing the new process.

Discussion points:
The CAA (Rebecca Roberts-Hughes) also detailed how they had employed an external consultant to review the existing Airspace Change Process. It was noted the external consultant had advised exploring the potential of introducing a further appeal process for any CAA decisions, beyond the existing Judicial Review process. It was explained the CAA had declined to do this, because they had insufficient staff and capacity to review their own decision making.

It was also explained the CAA had also decided not to pursue the external consultant’s proposal to introduce an Overview Committee to review the CAA’s work. The CAA was concerned that the volume of representatives and views raised at such a Committee would be too divergent. There was also apprehension that such a Committee would not be subject to regulatory guidance, whilst there was also a danger that the views of such a Committee could be heard over the views of the representatives engaged as part of any Airspace Change Process.

Passengers Representative and Vice-Chairman (Mrs R Tyler) highlighted the new timescales for the proposed Airspace Change Process. She noted the consultation process would now be over 2 years and queried whether this should be a cause for concern. The CAA (Rebecca Roberts-Hughes) explained the intention was to strengthen what they did and how they did it. It was explained the extended consultation process was intended to allow greater engagement of effected groups, as well as more effective decision making. The Airport Company (David Winstanley) also noted the new timescales proposed for the Airspace Change Process – it was emphasised that, if this enable greater transparency and more effective engagement of effected parties, it should be welcomed.

RESOLVED
That the CAA’s consultation on the airspace change decision-making process be noted.

30. PASSENGER SERVICES - 30 MINS

The Airport Company (Chris Wilson) provided an update on Terminal Operations. The following topics were raised:
- Improvements to Check-in processes
- Upgrading of the Baggage Belt System
- Enhancement of security arrangements
- Improvements to immigration processes
- Increases in capacity of Arrivals Carousels
- Overall Process Improvement, including the development of a continuous improvement programme

The Airport Company (Deane Arnold) also provided the work undertaken with various disability groups, including the following:
- On 20th April 2016, the Airport Company held their second Open Day for Persons with Reduced Mobility.
The Airport Company offers the opportunity for local disability groups to have a stand for one day a month at the Airport, located next to the Special Assistance Helpdesk.

Dementia Champions work

Autism Awareness work

The ACC also received an update on the various performance statistics collected, which included the following. As part of this, the ACC was requested to identify which specific statistics they wished to receive updates on.

- Baggage Delivery Performance
- Bussing statistics
- Air rail performance
- Passengers with Reduced Mobility (PRM) movements
- Security Queue Time Performance

Discussion points:

Berkswell Parish Council (Cllr R Lloyd) noted the Self Service Bag Drop and queried how this worked. The Airport Company (Chris Wilson) explained how it was similar to the self service areas provided in supermarkets. He detailed how it was designed to enable the customer to undertake as many functions as possible when making the booking, so they could focus on collecting the tickets at the Airport. It was also noted the Self Service drop would flag up if a passengers bags exceeded the stipulated weight and the language it used could be varied. It was explained the Self Service drop flagged up the necessary security questions. The Airport Company also confirmed that assistants were on hand to help, if passengers were experiencing any issues.

The Knowle Society (Mrs L Baker) highlighted the PRM statistics and queried whether this only included passengers who pre-notified the airlines. The Airport Company (Dean Arnold) explained these statistics included all passengers with reduced mobility, irrespective of whether they pre-notified the airline or not. He detailed the work they undertook with airline companies to encourage passengers to pre-notify.

Catherine De Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) emphasised that, in regards to baggage delivery, the waiting time could be a significant issue for passengers. It was noted targets were identified with the baggage handling companies. Mr Cuthbert queried whether there was any means of conveying the expected waiting times for baggage delivery with the passengers. The Airport Company (Chris Wilson) confirmed it wasn’t possible to convey such information at that stage, as the technology wasn’t in place. He explained that further technological developments should allow them to convey expected waiting times to the handling agents, via their control centre.

Passengers Representative and Vice-Chairman (Mrs R Tyler) welcomed the passenger information detailed within the presentation. She explained it could be beneficial for the ACC to receive the following information:

- For baggage handling, it would be helpful to receive statistics detailing the performance of individual handling agents and airlines. It was also requested for the first and last baggage delivery times to be recorded.
For bussing statistics, it would be helpful to receive further information, such as statistics for both arriving and departing flights.

For Air rail performance, it would be beneficial to receive further statistics, such as outages and any exception reporting.

It would also be helpful to receive statistics on cleaning performances within the terminals, as well as customer satisfaction levels.

Passengers Representative and Vice-Chairman (Mrs R Tyler) also highlighted the performance monitoring for Passengers with Reduced Mobility. She detailed how she would liaise with the Airport Company about this, outside of the meeting. Mrs Tyler also expressed concern that the quality standard agreements for PRM’s measured passengers having to wait for up to 45 minutes. The Airport Company (Deane Arnold) emphasised they recognised this and detailed how they had separate stricter key performance indicators with their suppliers for PRM’s, and this could potentially be shared with the ACC.

Wychwood Club (Mr G Heaps) queried whether there was any potential to prioritise baggage based on the type of passenger. He highlighted the issues passengers with toddlers in trollies could experience. The Airport Company (Chris Wilson) detailed how such issues were partly attributable due to the layout of the Airport and they would look to address this through future design. He also explained how they were working with the different airlines and baggage handlers, to ensure they prioritised passengers with trollies.

**RESOLVED**
That the update on Passenger Services be noted.

**31. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT UPDATE - 10 MINS**

The Airport Company (Rob Eaton) conducted a presentation, detailing the planned development across the airport site. The topics raised included the following:

- The development of the A380 Airbridge
- The construction of the Bussing Lounge and International Pier
- The development of Gates 43 and 45
- The refurbishment of the Elmdon Building
- An update on the Airport Master Plan
- The Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) – the development of a Transport Interchange Hub at Birmingham International Station, connecting to the proposed HS2 Interchange, Airport, as well as local public transport links.

**RESOLVED**
That the Planning and Development Update be noted.

**32. HEALTH ACTION PLAN UPDATE - 10 MINS**
BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE - 18 May 2016

The Chairman (Colin Flack) drew Members attention to the draft version of the Health Action Plan that had been circulated prior to the meeting. It was agreed for the Plan to be considered at the next meeting.

33. CHADWICK END PARISH COUNCIL - APPLICATION TO JOIN ACC - 5 MINS

The Airport Company (Andy Holding) explained that the above Parish Council had expressed an interest in joining the ACC. He detailed how this matter had been discussed at a previous meeting of the ACC Steering Group, where it was suggested the Secretary could write to the Parish Council, requesting their reasons for wishing to join the Committee. Following this, the response received from the Parish Council could be considered at a future Steering Group meeting in July. The Steering Group could then make a recommendation regarding membership, to be considered at the next ACC meeting on 17th August. ACC Members agreed for this approach to be adopted.

RESOLVED

The ACC agreed for the Secretary to write to Chadwick End Parish Council, requesting their reasons for wishing to join the ACC. The response to initially be considered by the ACC Steering Group.

34. MEMBERS INDUCTION AND REFRESHER PROGRAMME - 5 MINS

The Knowle Society (Mrs L Baker) explained how, at the previous ACC Steering Group meeting, they had discussed the potential of introducing an induction programme for any new Members, which could also act as a refresher programme for existing Members. It was detailed how the induction information could include guidance notes for initial meetings, as well as how to find relevant information. Mrs L Baker explained that experienced ACC Members could act as mentors for new Members recently appointed to the Committee. ACC Members supported the introduction of such an induction programme.

RESOLVED

The ACC agreed for the Steering Group to identify proposals for a Members Induction and Refresher programme, to be considered at the next ACC meeting on 17th August 2016.

35. AOB - 5 MINS

The Chairman (Colin Flack) informed the Committee, the Mr D Morgan and Mr D Read of Hampton in Arden Society and Barston Parish Council respectively, had both recently decided to step down from representing their organisations at the ACC. The Chairman thanked both Mr Morgan and Mr Read for all the work they had undertaken on behalf of the Committee and wished them both well for the future. It was agreed for the Secretary to write to Mr Morgan and Mr Read, on behalf of the ACC.
Time Not Specified