

Sir Howard Davies
Airports Commission

2nd February, 2015

Dear Sir Howard,

HEATHROW AIRPORT EXPANSION

We hereby respond to your consultation regarding the two proposals for expansion at Heathrow Airport. We will not comment on the Gatwick proposal as we do not believe it is our place to do so. This response could equally apply to other Heathrow communities.

For the sake of clarity we list your question followed by our response. Any reference to Colnbrook refers to the whole parish of Colnbrook with Poyle, and therefore includes Brands Hill and the Westfield Estate.

Any reference to Heathrow means "the airport" as we understand that should the Hub proposal be approved then Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) will simply purchase the rights/copyright from Heathrow Hub Limited (HHL).

This response sets out the case for the proposed extension of Heathrow Airport to be rejected for the reasons outlined herein. Duplication will naturally occur due to the questions being responded to.

Q1: What conclusions, if any, do you draw in respect of the three short-listed options?

1a). The short listed locations have a short term outlook and ignore the UK's desire to reach out to the regions following recent changes to central government policy. These policy changes could be interpreted as having a major effect on the original ground

rules for your consultation, and we consider that a revisiting of your original remit may be in order.

1b). There is a slow decline in hub based flights and a rapid increase in A to B flights via low cost airlines. These low cost airlines are now looking at branching out into the long haul sector and looking to join up with the major carrier groupings.

[Ryanair 20th January 2015] [Easy jet 31st January 2015]

1c). A hub airport so close to a world class city with no realistic space for development except by the unwanted destruction of the strategic gap between Slough and West London; parts of the Colne Valley Park and a valuable part of our housing stock, cannot be seen as a serious option due to the detrimental effects on hundreds of thousands of human lives. Perhaps we shouldn't forget the thousands of pets suffering the noise and air pollution as well. It must not be overlooked that 28% of all European citizens affected by airport pollution live in London. That is a situation that must not be increased any further.

If any expansion is to take place in the south east of England it must not be at Heathrow for health and competition reason alone. There are more viable options than those being considered in this consultation.

1d). If any expansion is approved at Heathrow existing carriers at Gatwick will clamour for the new slots available at Heathrow, in addition to the targeted airlines from the near and far east, China, India and South America thereby enhancing Heathrow's dominance in the south east. Gatwick will decline, making the future case for a fourth runway at Heathrow stronger and further adding to its dominance of the UK market and stifling competition even more. That would leave Heathrow (and IAG/British Airways in particular) with a monopolistic hold on the south east, higher fares, and little serious competition. Exactly what the UK does not want or need.

[Refer to IAG's proposed take over of Air Lingus]

Q2: Do you have any suggestions for how the short-listed options could be improved, i.e. their benefits enhanced or negative impacts mitigated?

2a). Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) and Heathrow Hub Limited (HHL) both admit that their proposals regarding new aircraft and flight paths have not been approved by the CAA or ATC and that it would take some years to reach agreement. No conclusions about routes or capacity can therefore be realistically estimated at this time; we could end up with a third runway with far less traffic than either of the Heathrow proposals are projecting, whilst having devastated the ancient communities around the existing Heathrow site.

2b). No appraisals exist regarding the sites for the new homes required should either of the Heathrow options be approved. Where do you put 70,000 new homes within the Heathrow catchment area without leading to vastly increased road traffic, and demands on local services such as schools, medical facilities and the local road network?

It was stated at the Commissions meeting at Heathrow on 3rd December that no consultations had taken place with any local authorities regarding the proposed housing requirements – a very serious oversight and one that must be addressed before any conclusions are reached.

2c). Due to developments since the short list was published, many reports have been published regarding air quality, noise pollution, economic benefits, funding of infrastructure projects etc resulting from either proposal, and of course we must not ignore the human rights issues around “living in peace and having a family life”.

(Ref; <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>)

The majority of these reports cast doubts on Heathrow being a serious contender for any expansion now or in the future. For our detailed comments on these matters see our response to question 8 below.

2d). By way of a summary answer to this question, there are no benefits to be enhanced, although the following measures could mitigate any future development should Colnbrook be selected:-

Local access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A direct bus service between Colnbrook and Heathrow, free for employees and residents. • A safe, uninterrupted, dedicated cycle way from Colnbrook to Heathrow (i.e. not a green painted strip alongside a busy carriageway). • Extension of the Piccadilly line to Colnbrook Village and Brands Hill and onto Slough. • End of the “tax” on local taxis – why should local firms be forced to pickup and drop-off in the Short Term Car Park at a cost of £3 a time to the local population.
Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 spur to Heathrow to be considered with a Third Runway. • Links to both the Great Western Line and South Western lines to be implemented.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional free onsite parking for airport employees to stop roadside parking in Colnbrook. • Resident parking schemes for the worst affected parts of Colnbrook.
Respite	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least as good as now, with the 3pm daily rotation. • Cranford Agreement restrictions (which continue to impose unfair distribution of flights over Colnbrook despite the official end in 2010) must be lifted as an absolute condition of any expansion plan.
Air pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional independently managed air quality monitoring stations placed throughout the village at 200m intervals • A comprehensive action plan starting immediately to reduce air pollution to within EU and WHO limits within 5 years, with measurable interim targets. • Regular real time reporting of air quality measurements directly available to all residents via a dedicated website. • A new upper limit alert with meaningful measures if broken (i.e. planes grounded, lane closures on arterial routes, immediate cessation of activities contributing to pollution such as

	<p>incineration) and steep fines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absolute embargoes on ANY new sources of pollution until EU and WHO limits are met. • A low emissions zone extended around the airport, to include ALL vehicles.
Incinerator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be re-built outside of the parish. This should never have been allowed so close to the single-largest pollution source in the UK.
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colnbrook By-pass should be tunneled, not diverted through or around the village. There must be NO new roads through the village zones. • No net loss of land as a result of road changes. • A new access-only scheme to prevent the “rat run” between M4 and M25. Consideration of automatic barriers and free passes for residents. • Consideration of a Congestion Zone around Heathrow, with no charge for residents.
Community Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both local schools, the Young Persons Centre, the Colnbrook Village Hall and the Westfield Community Centre should be rebuilt during the airport construction timescale with the latest noise and air pollution mitigations built in. Other community buildings, including local churches, should receive additional noise insulation. The full cost to be borne by the developers.
Green belt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No net loss of Green Belt land from ancillary expansion associated with the airport (freight, hotels, etc) or housing. • Nominal Green Belt sites in the parish that have succumbed to unenforced development due to their proximity to the airport (i.e. Poyle Place) should be reinstated and funds allocated for active management of local biodiversity. • Protection and active management of Old Wood to prevent further erosion. • The Strategic Gap should be given legal protection to prevent further encroachment in view of Heathrow Hub’s suggestion to move forward with the SIFE development.
Freight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HGVs banned from local roads with enforcement provided. • HGV routes designated and facilities provided on-airport. • A rail-oriented 30-year plan for freight to be considered at the same time as a Third Runway. No more piecemeal applications and temporary permissions. • A clear commitment and timescale for the Colnbrook Logistics Centre to revert to green belt.
Compensation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25% above market value for homes and businesses displaced at an independently agreed pre-blight market value. • Recovery of legitimate costs associated with tenants having to relocate through no fault of their own. • A 12-month interest free bridging loan for tenants forced to relocate, to cover tenancy deposit. • Compensation for employees who lose their jobs as a result of businesses forced to relocate • A sliding scale of Council Tax rebate based on exposure to noise above and beyond WHO-accepted minimum levels, whether newly affected or not. Full Council Tax rebate for properties worst affected.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration to the immediate adoption and enforcement of a compensation scheme similar to that available from Gatwick Airport Limited • Legally enforceable agreements for all such proposals from Heathrow due to their previous record of being dishonest to residents.
Noise disturbance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New 15m high bunds along the runway perimeter similar to the wall of green corridors on the approach to T5. • Existing arterial routes should be screened with fencing to mitigate noise. • Triple glazing for all properties within the WHO minimum standard. • An outright ban on the noisier aircraft types. • Green planting to compensate for lost green belt lands. • Implement in full the recommendations of the All Party Parliamentary Group on Heathrow and the Wider Economy report from December 2014, including adoption of WHO measures for noise reporting, legal status for noise protection, and short and long-term (25 year) plan for reducing air traffic noise.
Community engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a forum to allow residents/resident associations (as distinct to council representatives) to directly engage with the airport to discuss issues of concern including noise, air quality, local traffic, night flights, and construction. • Provide regular reporting to residents on concerns raised and measures implemented.
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An absolute cap on capacity enshrined in law, index-linked to the number of people living with excess noise or air pollution.
Night flights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new routes must all be scheduled for daytime slots. • An end to ALL night flights within a year of new capacity being available.
Hub status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active promotion of point-to-point links from other airports, to transfer some of the most the duplicated vanity routes to where they can better serves the traveler. • Greater emphasis on regional airports in the hub model to avoid over concentration of flights at Heathrow. • A new Hub test for allocation of new slots to avoid filling the hub with routes that can economically stand alone or be based elsewhere.
Community Cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentives to encourage resettlement of houses vacated by families – free childcare, better facilities, discounts for long-term occupants. • All houses purchased by the developers to be put into a “Colnbrook Housing Trust” after upgrading works, to be administered by a reputable housing association (NOT Slough Borough Council), and available to Colnbrook residents and key workers in order to provide some semblance of an ongoing community within Colnbrook. • Whatever the outcome this must be the last attempt to increase the size of Heathrow Airport, and this should be set in law; perhaps designating a half mile ring around the existing site as not available for any airport related development.

Flood alleviation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In acknowledgement that Heathrow has long impacted local waterways, implement a single responsibility/accountability for maintenance of all local waterways, including dredging. • Modeling of surface water impact of expansion, compared to existing capacity of local waterways and a plan to increase drainage during the construction of the new runway.
Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Management Plan to be approved locally to include details of temporary housing for construction workers, use of rail for construction traffic, keeping construction related traffic off local roads, and mitigation for noise and air pollution during construction.
Flight paths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guarantee of consultation prior to final expansion plans being approved. • Involvement of those affected in design of new flight paths going forward, including a commitment to consult before future changes are made.
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferential consideration of local people for employment opportunities. • Apprenticeships to be actively promoted to our young people.

Q3: Do you have any comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal?

Other than not fully understanding how Heathrow came to be shortlisted in the first place we have no comment.

Q4: In your view, are there any relevant factors that have not been fully addressed by the Commission to date?

See also our response to Q2 above, and our summary at the end of this response.

4a). The Commission estimates the cost of the associated works to the public purse at £6.3bn for Heathrow Hub; £5.7bn for Heathrow; and £787,000 for Gatwick.

The Heathrow subsidies are unacceptable to taxpayers in these strained economic times as this amounts to a third or more of the developer's estimated costs. Equally important is that this funding is in effect "state aid" which could fall foul of European legislation. This aspect has not been adequately explained.

[<https://www.gov.uk/state-aid>]

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/261384/bis_131330_state_aid_the_basics.pdf]

4b). Competition issues have not been adequately explained as explained in our answer to question 1 above. As far back as 1990 research by Berkeley University demonstrated that where you have dominant airlines (BA/AIG) based at hubs the fares were up to 45% higher than for equivalent routes from non hub airports.

[<http://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/borenste/download/Regulation90AirDereg.pdf>]

4c). The health and wellbeing of residents, and particularly the young and old, have not been sufficiently considered. The infant mortality rate is well above the UK average

[Slough Child Health Profile March 2014].

4d). Deaths from lung cancer in Slough are consistently above those for the UK as a whole, above those for London Boroughs, and above those for the South East in general, and the mortality rates for older people due to the effects of air pollution are amongst the highest in the UK.

[<http://www.slough.gov.uk/council/strategies-plans-and-policies/cancer.aspx>]

[2M Group of cross part MP's report on EU Air Quality Directive]

[<http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/2014/12/eu-ruling-on-air-pollution-compliance-is-a-major-blow-for-heathrow-airport-expansion-plans/>]

[House of Commons, Environmental Audit Committee - Action on Air Quality Sixth Report of Session 2014–15]

4e). Colnbrook and the surrounding villages are ancient communities and therefore many of the older treasured buildings have no proper footings compared to the standards of today. With both proposals bringing runways closer to the village this will vastly increase the vibration to these buildings leading to the degradation of the support mechanisms currently in place.

This has not been considered at all within these proposals.

4f). No consideration has been given the effects on our local diverse bird life in either of the proposals. Both proposals encroach onto green belt and agriculture land which will extend the use of various sonic devices to deter birds entering aircraft engines. This will further assist in the decimation of our wild life not only in our gardens but in the Coln Valley Park and surrounding wildlife refuges.

4g). We cannot see any reference to some eighteen former landfill sites that will need to be excavated and cleaned up if Heathrow is chosen for expansion. Due to the lack of any meaningful controls when these were first worked we would suggest that a great deal of work will be necessary to establish exactly what was buried in each of these pits and the likely impact on our communities if and when excavations begin. We understand that these are referred to in a recent report produced by E C Harris Transport Consultants, in a report prepared for Gatwick Airport Limited.

Q5: Do you have any comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal of specific topics (as defined by the Commission's 16 appraisal modules), including methodology and results?

No comment.

Q6: Do you have any comments on the Commission's sustainability assessments, including methodology and results?

6a). Heathrow Airport Limited has already stated that it eventually wants 4 runways and we feel that this Commission should address the two Heathrow proposals on the

basis that they are in fact a proposal for two new runways at Heathrow and therefore the combined effect on West London and the Thames Valley, and Colnbrook in particular, should be subject to very detailed considerations. Colnbrook would cease to be a viable community if one new runway were approved; with two it would be obliterated.

6b). With regard to noise pollution, recent medical reports point to consistent noise as having a greater detrimental effect of resident's health than simply high noise levels for limited times. Both Heathrow proposals refer to high decibel levels and ignore these recent advances in medical knowledge and so this matter will need to be considered in much more detail.

The increase in flight numbers, even with quieter aircraft in years to come, will have serious health implications for our communities.

[Noise from Heathrow Airport - An Inquiry by the All Party Parliamentary Group on Heathrow and the Wider Economy 18th December 2014]

6c). No account has been taken on the flood implications for the Colnbrook and Poyle communities. The developers must pay for a detailed appraisal of the risks by an independent consultancy and must also pay for all flood elevation works. It is unacceptable for the Heathrow bidders to say this is not their problem; it is.

6d). The air quality issue has existed for over 15 years, and still exceed European limits. Worse still they cannot meet WHO levels.

Without these issues being fully resolved before a single extra flight is authorised at Heathrow neither proposal is sustainable. One cannot heap more negatives on a negative situation and achieve a positive result.

We would refer you to the recently issued flyer "*The European Environment — State and Outlook 2015*", and to the full report to be published on 4th March 2015.

Q7: Do you have any comments on the Commission's business cases, including methodology and results?

7a). We consider that far too much emphasis has been placed on the doubtful economic benefits to an area which already has a severe lack of affordable housing; schools blighted by the existing airport; severe road transport problems; a lack of public amenities; illegal air quality issues; noise pollution issues; and unacceptably high mortality rates among our infants and older persons. The High Court threw out an application in 2010 on the basis that the economic plan was untenable. It still is.

These serious issues will only be compounded by a third or even fourth runway.

[\[http://makewealthhistory.org/2010/03/26/heathrow-third-runway-in-disarray-as-high-court-labels-plans-untenable/\]](http://makewealthhistory.org/2010/03/26/heathrow-third-runway-in-disarray-as-high-court-labels-plans-untenable/)

7b). West London has a relatively low unemployment rate so we don't exactly need the new jobs in this area. Slough is full – it has no meaningful land bank for housing or new businesses, and is only planning to build 300 homes this year.

7c). The planned Network Rail link to Heathrow Airport from Reading is claiming that this project alone will lead to the creation of 42,000 new jobs in the Thames Valley region. That is yet more pressure on homes, schools and public services in an already stressed area. Where are these people going to live; where are their children going to school; where are the doctors and nurses to look after them?

7d). Economically West London and East Berkshire do not need more pressures heaped upon it by either of these proposed developments. A single foreign owned company (with some very dubious connections) must not be allowed to profit at the expense of many hundreds of thousands, possibly millions, of residents' quality of life. The cost to the NHS is incalculable, for reasons outlined above, and we do not think for one minute that the airports current or future foreign owners will bear these costs or contribute honestly to the UK's corporation tax revenue stream.

Q8: Do you have any other comments?

Yes.

8a). The ten unacceptable answers to residents' questions:-

These questions were asked at the Airports Commission Enquiry held on 3rd December, 2014 and are followed by the response from the developers – in most cases by Heathrow Airport Limited and agreed to by Heathrow Hub Limited. They are extracted from notes taken during our attendance at that meeting.

i). Has either promoter agreed the proposed flight paths with the CCA and ATC? No

The developers therefore do not know whether there is sufficient capacity for the c260,000 extra annual flights that these plans involve.

ii). Can Heathrow control the aircraft that use the airport? No.

Airport users are controlled by the CCA and ATC and therefore neither developer has direct control over noise or air pollution matters.

iii). Has Heathrow carried out a full freight assessment? No.

Neither developer has undertaken a road freight assessment and their proposals for any new road configuration cannot be compared with expected levels of road traffic, and therefore any proposals in this regard are very questionable.

iv). Have you explored sites for replacement housing? No.

Neither developer has had any discussions with any local authority within the Heathrow catchment area with regard to replacement housing for those to be demolished. (Between 750 and 3,750 homes)

v). Have you explored sites for the 70,000 new homes? No.

Neither developer has had any discussions with any local authority within the Heathrow catchment area with regard to housing for the expected 70,000 new jobs.

vi). Have you considered community cohesion in any of your plans? No.
Neither developer has considered the effects of their proposals on any local community.

vii). Have you considered our children in any of your plans? No.
Infant health locally is amongst the worst in the country, and doesn't seem to be important enough to figure in their plans.

vii). Do you know where the replacement school(s) will be built? No.
Again our children have not been considered; despite the possibility that one or more of our schools is in danger of closure should either proposal be granted.

viii) Will you be dealing with flood alleviation matters in Colnbrook? No.
The developers actually stated that flooding in Colnbrook was not their concern – “that's down to the Environment Agency”. And the taxpayer of course!

ix). Are respite periods guaranteed? No
Neither developer can make promises over the respite periods. These are frequently overruled by the CAA and the ATC for safety reasons – some 50% in 2012/13.

x). Do the proposals comply with climate change legislation? We don't know.
Amazingly no assessment has been carried out by either proposer.

We find it absolutely astonishing that the enquiry could be in a position in the near future to grant permission for such a major infrastructure project without such fundamental questions having a positive answer. All of the above must be properly answered prior to a spade touching the proverbial sod.

8b). Compensation

i). Compensation to Colnbrook residents, and businesses, is yet to be confirmed with the story appearing to change after each road show. We demand that a defined scheme be imposed upon the developers, possibly along the lines of that implemented by Gatwick, and be drawn up without further delay and certainly not awaiting the final decision of the Commission. Any such scheme must include owner occupiers, landlords and tenants, and local businesses affected by the proposals.

ii). Any and all compensation must be targeted at the individuals, organisations, groups, businesses and communities directly affected by these outlandish proposals, and not passed to any local authority to get lost in budgets and spent on glory projects.

SUMMARY

We ask the Commission to pay particular attention to the following concerns:-

Air Pollution

People should have the fundamental right to breathe air without the fear that it is shortening their lives. Those living with pollution generated by Heathrow, either in the sky or at ground level by road traffic, cannot do that. Increasing flight numbers by 260,000 per annum condemns workers, residents, and their children to ill health and premature death. It is doubtful whether EU limits will ever be met.

Noise

People who live or work near Heathrow are already subjected to stress caused by high levels of noise. Currently 28% of all those in the whole of Europe affected by aircraft noise live around Heathrow. These residents have suffered enough. All jet aircraft are noisy and even introducing less noisy aircraft over the next 40 years will not make much difference because of the increase in flight numbers. More people will also be affected by road noise. Only a small fraction of those affected will be eligible for mitigation.

Housing

It would be detrimental to the country to recommend that a large area of housing development be made uninhabitable. Britain is suffering a housing crisis with demand far outstripping supply and yet Heathrow expansion would destroy the homes of thousands of people. Anything from 783 to 3,750 homes would be directly affected with many thousands more blighted forever. Communities built up over centuries would be obliterated for ever.

The north-west option would see the Toll House estate decimated and the Westfield estate subject to massive increases in noise levels and air pollution. The Hub option would see most of Poyle demolished, and the housing stock to the south of the High Street and at Brands Hill subject to increased levels of noise and increased pollution levels. Effectively Colnbrook would be totally devastated, and even assuming the granting of the mitigation steps above, serious harm would be inflicted upon this ancient historic community.

Cost

Expansion at Heathrow cannot be delivered due to the unbearable cost to airline passengers and particularly UK taxpayers. The foreign investors who own Heathrow expect to make a profit and already avoid many UK taxes. Current infrastructure also needs massive investment in order to cope. Heathrow takes no responsibility for replacing social housing, schools, public facilities or maintaining local roads. These bills will fall to UK taxpayers.

Economic Benefits

Any benefit to UK Plc is dubious. The costs for Britain will be enormous. If there is any argument for spending money on airport expansion it is likely that the country would see greater benefit if investment was made elsewhere.

Competition

Recent corporate announcements point to a trend of amalgamation and cross shareholdings in the world's large airline groups. We have the recently accepted bid by IAG/BA for Aer Lingus; and today (30th inst) Qatar Airlines announced that it had

built up a stake of 9.99% in IAG/BA. Where will this trend lead and what are the likely effects on competition issues.

The Sovereign Wealth Fund that owns Qatar Airlines also owns a 20% stake in Heathrow Airport Limited, and has a seat on the board. With its new holding in IAG it will doubtless have a seat on that board leading to potential conflicts of interest.

This new relationship is unlikely to lead to lower fares! (see 4b) above)

(Note; The Qatari director at Heathrow Airport Limited (Akbar al-Baker) is on record as having suggested that Heathrow should have 24 hour flights, and suggested that people living under the flight path "should stop fussing over the noise". A very unfriendly neighbour!)

Human Rights

The UK Government has a duty to protect the right of its citizens to live in peace and to have a family life. Any decision made to add a third or fourth runway at Heathrow would undoubtedly lead to a challenge in the courts and the European Court of Human Rights.

Flooding

Colnbrook and many other areas close to Heathrow already suffer from severe flooding. It would be irresponsible to recommend laying vast amounts of concrete in this area, regardless of any reports commissioned by Heathrow. Ultimately it will be the British public that pays for damage to domestic property caused by foreign speculators.

Safety

Residents want to give the strongest possible notice to the Commission that it will place people's lives at risk if it recommends further expansion at Heathrow. Recent events, including a near miss between a passenger aircraft and a drone near Heathrow, and an increase in terrorist activity, should not be ignored. In spring 2014 the Airport Operators Association magazine focussed on the Davies Commission and included an article on airport security that said, "the terrorist threat level in the UK is 'substantial'".

Increasing the number of aircraft flying over densely populated areas around Heathrow and our capital is taking chances based on the past safety record. The crash of a 777 just inside the Heathrow boundary in January 2008 could have killed hundreds of people. A former Transport Secretary has already told the Commission, "*We cannot beat the odds forever*".

The Past

Heathrow Airport Limited, as previous agents for the now defunct BAA, has a history of being less than honest with the Heathrow communities. In fact the CEO of HAL admitted at the meeting on December 3rd 2014 that his company had lied to us in the past - "*but let us put that behind us*".

British Airways is not an innocent party either. In 2001 British Airways (BA) called for a third runway: "Mr Eddington insisted that it was essential that Heathrow had a third runway as well as a fifth terminal..." (Daily Mail, 5 January 2001 - reporting on a speech to a business conference on 4 January) But Mr Eddington changes his line when speaking to local residents: "BA is not pushing for a third runway at Heathrow..." (Ealing Times, 1 February 2001).

For this reason we would ask that all promises by all developers are fully documented and subject to legally enforceable contracts with each and every affected community before any development is approved.

[http://www.foe.co.uk/sites/default/files/downloads/heathrow_broken_promises.pdf]

"We are absolutely delighted for the people of [Heathrow], who already suffer from massive noise and pollution caused by Heathrow, and pleased that we have been able to help bring about this victory after a long and hard-fought battle with ministers and BAA."

Quote 2010 Cllr Barbara Reid, Hounslow, following the victory over the original third runway proposals

The Future

The Commission believes a further runway in the south east will be required by 2050 and has not ruled out Heathrow for a third or even fourth runway. Heathrow Airport Limited has stated that it wants four runways. Whatever the decision regarding this consultation the many hundreds of thousands of residents around Heathrow require some peace of mind about the future.

Whatever your final decision, you must remove the continuous blight faced by the residents of the Borough's neighbouring Heathrow by imposing a 50 year block on any further expansion of the site. In recent years alone Colnbrook has suffered with Terminal 5; the Grondon incinerator; a proposed Rail Freight interchange; and the ever present threat of numerous gravel pits. This week it has been announced that a new underground rail link to Heathrow from the Great Western line will afflict Colnbrook for many years to come.

It is about time this stopped and we, the residents of the Heathrow communities, be allowed respite from all major planning issues for a very long time.

Yours sincerely,

For and on behalf of the Colnbrook Community Association,