

For variable parts of the day, noisy aircraft fly over my home in Kew, Richmond and also peaceful Kew Gardens and Richmond Park. I am disturbed by it in the garden and inside my house, when conversations and telephone calls are **interrupted**, or when using parks etc in the surrounding area. **Pupils at school under the flight path cannot hear when planes pass overhead if they are outside and there is some disturbance within the classrooms, when no one can hear for a minute at a time, repeatedly over a time period.** (I write as a governor of a Richmond Borough secondary school, under the flightpath and as a parent.) BAA offer double glazing plans, so they admit their planes cause a problem. At least, currently, I can tell myself that soon the noise will stop when planes come into land at Heathrow by another route. I still hear them from my garden, but it is not disturbing.

The first few flights in the morning occur at 4-5am and as they are big planes coming from the Far East they are very loud indeed. **Expansion may bring about more early morning flights and indeed may introduce night flights** - which as far as I am concerned would bring about sleep deprivation for many.

If any proposed expansion goes ahead it is likely that the noise and disturbance will increase markedly. A third runway could lead to another and indeed further terminals, on the **thin edge of the wedge principle.**

I have often thought it a **nonsense** to have such a major airport as Heathrow so close to a high density population. **Under the flightpath, we are vulnerable to pollution from discard aviation fuel, noise** as previously mentioned, **accident and terrorism**

While I benefit from proximity to Heathrow when I am travelling or collecting or dropping off travellers, **I would make that small sacrifice to have peace and quiet (as much as town living can be such), to have reduced pollution and increased safety against accident or terrorism).**

Engineers should think creatively about **alternative uses for the Heathrow site:**

The Heathrow site should be maintained as it is, if not indeed **scaled down, rather than expanded.** A site away from high population density should be found – many have been proposed. Improved public transport and rapid and secure transit between existing airports may allow all of the London cooperatively to act as a London Hub. Travellers could travel between airports, perhaps on dedicated services, rest, eat, shop, much as they do in an airport. If the transfer was managed for them travellers would still consider London as a viable hub, easy to use, much as they do at present inside individual airports. If the Heathrow site was scaled down, the land, close to the rest of London and the area to the west, could be put to good use – anything from housing & industry, or, more creatively, a return to farmland, modern hydroponic agriculture, sports, education, solar PV electricity generation, wind farm electricity generation, ground and air source heat pump heat reclamation. These latter 3 would contribute to UK meeting its target for distributed electrical generation. Any urban development could take advantage of combined heat & power, sharing 'waste heat' with local houses and indeed could be a solar powered village with PV systems at every possible point. Grass roofs etc could be employed. **All sorts of renewable and carbon neutral**

systems could be employed, making the Heathrow site an example to the rest of the world, yet providing a massive 'brownfield' site upon which to provide much needed homes in the Greater London Area – all with the excellent infrastructure for travel.

Improved public transport in the London area to accommodate a London-wide Hub for air travel would bring about huge benefits