



Airports Commission  
**Heathrow Public Discussion Session**  
3 December 2014

**Opening Remarks**

**Sir Howard Davies**

**Chair, Airports Commission**

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

Good morning. I think we will make a start. First of all, welcome and thank you for coming along. This is a very important part of our process. The process that we are engaged in is a long and slightly complicated one, and so probably it would help situate the discussions today if I just say briefly where the Commission is in its processes. Before I do that, I should introduce three other members of the Commission. There are five of us, and four of us could be here today: John Armitt, Julia King and Ricky Burdett. Phil Graham, at the end, is the Secretary to the Commission and a number of our staff are here; you will see them identified by their badges.

**II. The Work of the Airports Commission**

**1. Phase 1: Need**

The Commission has been working for about two years now. In the first phase of our work we looked at the question of need: whether there was an argument for an additional new runway or runways in the South East. We also invited proposers to put forward ideas for additional capacity if they thought it justified. The conclusion of that report last December was that in our view, looking at all of the range of forecasts, while we did not follow the traditional predict-and-provide model, we believed that there was a case for one net new runway somewhere in London and the South East by 2030, and that that additional capacity and the flight movements associated with it could be accommodated within the legislated climate change targets. That is therefore our planning assumption. We thought it probable that another runway would be needed by 2050, but that is not the focus of our work today.

## **2. Thames Estuary Proposal**

The invitation for proposals produced a surprising number of ideas – over 50 – but we whittled them down to three that we thought plausible, two of them at Heathrow, one at Gatwick. We also decided to do some more work to see whether a whole new airport in the estuary was a plausible alternative. We did a lot of work on that during the course of this year, but concluded in September that it was not. The environmental obstacles, the cost obstacles and the fact that it was in the wrong place for the demand were such as to mean that we did not think we could recommend that option.

## **3. Heathrow and Gatwick**

We are left with a shortlist of two options at Heathrow, both of which we will hear about so I will not begin to describe them myself, and one at Gatwick. We are tasked by the Prime Minister with producing recommendations immediately after the next election. Of course, which Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister we will be delivering it to is a matter of some doubt. The Deputy Prime Minister could be Nicola Sturgeon or Nigel Farage or whoever. That said, we will aim to complete the report by the election and address the envelope immediately after it, because the envelope may need re-addressing.

That is our objective. Just to remind you, the task that we were given was to recommend what was needed to maintain the UK's position as Europe's most important aviation hub. That was the task that we were given; it is sometimes forgotten in the debate.

## **III. Consultation**

That is the context. This is where are. We have issued for consultation a lot of material recently, and I apologise for the volume of it. It included the scheme promoters' documentation but also our commentary on it. In some cases we thought that they were being excessively optimistic in terms of cost and other things, and so our assessment, informed by consultants we have appointed ourselves – quite independent of the promoters – is the basis on which we are looking at these schemes. The consultation period is open until 3 February, and as part of that we are holding meetings of this kind, where we seek to get public views – the views of local authorities, Members of Parliament, etc. – to inform our process.

## **IV. Agenda**

That is what we are doing, and that is why today is very important for us. We have a slightly complicated programme. I would simply appeal at this point to the presenters to be as disciplined as they can be in terms of their use of time. As I say, we will look very carefully at any representations put to us, so if people wish to introduce and say, 'Look, I want to make three points but there is going to be a fuller document' that is absolutely fine. In fact, that is what we would hope for. My role and the Commission's role will be primarily to listen today and to try to keep the proceedings within the framework that we have set out.

We begin with the two scheme promoters, John Holland-Kaye from Heathrow Airport and Captain Jock Lowe from the Heathrow Hub, who are going to summarise the schemes themselves. Then we have a number of Members of Parliament who will talk about them, and then we will have some dialogue. The Commission may wish to ask questions; the promoters will wish to respond to some

of the points made. That will take us through to 11.00 and then I will introduce the next bit after that.

Thank you very much. Let let battle commence.

## **Promoters' Statements**

**John Holland-Kaye**

**Chief Executive Officer, Heathrow Airport Limited**

### **I. Preamble**

Thank you, Sir Howard, and thank you to the Commission. Welcome to all of you for coming and showing that this is an issue that matters to us. It is important, it is complex, but it matters to us. I think that the Airports Commission process has encouraged an informed debate about the role that aviation plays not just in the national economy but also for communities and the environment. I would like to thank the Commission for allowing the space for the full spectrum of views and evidence to emerge. Today is a good opportunity for us at Heathrow to share our expansion plans and to hear the views of our neighbours, the local community and local business.

### **II. The Case for Change**

Lack of capacity at Heathrow is restricting Britain's economic growth, constraining exports, and limiting inward investment and jobs. That is why we are having this discussion once more. The airports review is the best, and perhaps last, opportunity to connect all of Britain to global growth. This is a debate about the future of our country: whether we have the ambition to win the race for growth, to help Britain stay right at the heart of the global economy, as we have been for centuries. The Airports Commission has quantified what that means. It says expansion at Heathrow could generate up to £211 billion of economic growth, which is almost twice the annual NHS budget, and create up to 180,000 new jobs across Britain.

Today I want to talk about what that prize means for the local communities, businesses and authorities of West London, the Thames Valley and Surrey – our region. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to transform our region through sustainable growth, skilled jobs for local people, career-related training, more apprenticeships, better public spaces and improved public transport.

### **III. Past Mistakes**

I would like to start by recognising some of the mistakes of the past. I have spoken to local people about our plans for the future and many have pointed to a commitment made by BAA and Heathrow in the past. I have read the community leaflets distributed by the airport almost 20 years ago, which committed to permanently rule out a third runway at Heathrow. I am shocked by that commitment. It should never have been made and it could never be kept. That is not an excuse; it

is an apology. I am sorry that Heathrow made that commitment. It has hung over the relationship with local communities and has led to a deficit of trust that can only be repaired by demonstrating that we are a different company than in the past.

Secondly, I would like to turn to the third-runway proposal that was promoted in the last decade. In hindsight, I do not believe that we did enough to listen to the concerns of local communities about that proposal. We should have done more to reduce noise from aircraft and ensure that those people who stood to lose their homes or suffer more aircraft noise were treated fairly. We should have done more to help local people access the jobs that come from expansion. If there was a sense that economic benefits should trump environmental costs, or that national benefits should hold sway over local disruption, then I am sorry; we got it wrong.

## **IV. Heathrow in the Community**

### **1. Community Activities**

We have listened and we are responding. Our starting point has been to think about how an expanded Heathrow can fit better into our local community. How can we deliver the economic growth we need in our region in a sustainable way and ensure that those who are most impacted by expansion get the greatest benefits and are treated fairly? Heathrow is an integral part of our community. Almost one in four jobs in the local boroughs depend upon the airport. The parents of many of the children in local schools work at the airport. Many of the kids who go to those schools will come and work at the airport one day. Many of the large local employers in our region are here because Heathrow connects them to world markets. We alone pay around £100 million a year in business rates, which contributes to improving local amenities. We have a huge community programme, encouraging science, technology, engineering and maths teaching in schools; lecturing in local universities; helping colleagues become school governors; and investing in community projects such as the Iver Scout Hut or the Westside Youth Centre in Ealing.

Our starting point has been to listen to the needs of local people. That is why we are proposing a full-length runway which allows respite from noise, the biggest single issue for those who live under the flight path and something which was not achieved by the previous proposal.

### **2. Public Consultation**

When the Airports Commission shortlisted our proposal last year, we held a large public consultation with local residents, businesses and stakeholders. Over 13,000 people took the chance to have their say on our plans, with over 1,000 local residents attending 13 public exhibitions. The feedback has helped us to address local concerns, for example by preserving historic buildings in Harmondsworth or seeking a better location for the energy-from-waste plant, but it also showed us how we can deliver more with expansion than without: reducing noise and emissions by getting rid of routine stacking of planes over London; better flood defences; more open space, connected together by cycle paths; and working with schools and universities to make sure that the children in local schools today get the skills to fulfil up to 40,000 new jobs that will be created locally in an expanded Heathrow – pilots, engineers, IT specialists, customer service roles, security, ground handling and freight handling. The opportunity to create skilled, secure and well-paid careers can transform lives, tackle youth unemployment and fulfil aspirations.

## **V. Noise**

### **1. Proposed Mitigation**

Noise is one of the biggest issues. Although Heathrow is now quieter than it has been at any time since the 1970s we know many people are still disturbed by noise. We have designed our proposal so fewer people will be impacted by noise than today even with expansion, and the Commission has confirmed this. Our proposed runway is now located further west to reduce the number of people affected by noise and the approach is over the M4. The longer runway allows respite from noise for every community. Flight paths can also be designed to share noise more fairly, allowing 95% of those overflown to have respite for at least half the time. Aircraft will fly steeper approaches and touch down further along the runways so that they are higher over local communities, reducing noise. All these operational measures will be combined with quieter planes and better sound insulation. The Commission agrees that when compared to current noise levels, fewer people are predicted to be affected across all metrics.

### **2. Early-Morning Flights**

I know that early-morning flights are a particular concern for people living close to the airport, many of whom are regularly woken by aircraft today. Our ability to rotate the runway used for early-morning arrivals, combined with the ability to land further down the runway and fly a steeper landing approach, means there will be less noise from these flights for communities like Hounslow and Richmond with a three-runway Heathrow than with a two-runway Heathrow. The Commission's independent analysis has confirmed a third runway would lead to a positive impact for night-flights noise in the future. These are the significant improvements on previous proposals.

### **3. Immediate Measures**

Since I became Chief Executive in July, I have often been asked why we are not doing more now to reduce the impact of noise: things such as the point at which planes put down their landing gear; the whistling noise made by some A320s; and compliance with continuous-descent approaches. These are very fair questions. I have asked my team to list all the things that we could do as an airport community, find out how we are performing, and put an improvement plan together. Last week I wrote to the chief executives of 40 airlines who do not comply with all of our quieter-operating procedures, asking them to take steps to do so. The noise insulation in schools will be complete by the end of February and cooling for the classrooms that need it most by the end of the summer. We will also increase the number of schools with adobe learning spaces. Significantly increased noise fines came into effect last month and the proceeds will be invested in local community programmes through the Heathrow Community Fund.

Sound insulation is also an important part of managing the impact of noise. The £250 million we have allocated for noise mitigation is a significant improvement, almost three times more than was offered under the last proposal for expansion, but in the consultation process some people felt it still did not go far enough. We are therefore developing a further proposal and will make an announcement in the New Year. This will include extending the eligibility for insulation and increased investment in local schools. There will be fewer schools affected by noise at an expanded Heathrow than there are today.

## **VI. Home Demolition**

### **1. Compensation**

Although we have reduced the number of homes subject to compulsory purchase, I am very aware that our proposal still requires the demolition of 750 homes, and this is one of the most difficult and emotive topics in this debate. We need to treat our neighbours who stand to lose their homes fairly. Government guidance suggests a 10% premium to market value is an appropriate payment for home loss. We feel that is insufficient in this case, and in May we proposed to pay 25% above the unblighted market value plus legal fees and stamp duty costs for buying a new home. This was welcomed during our recent consultation on compensation, but some people living close to the airport boundary said they wanted the option of moving but were concerned it would be hard to sell their house. We think this is fair, and so on Monday we announced our intention, if expansion goes ahead, to offer those people who wish to move the same compensation as those whose homes will be compulsorily purchased.

### **2. Maintaining Communities**

People also want local villages to maintain a community feel. Where Heathrow purchases a property from a homeowner, we will refurbish and sound-insulate the property before reselling it in the open market. This will allow new homeowners to come into the area and some whose homes have been lost to stay in their community. This also has to be approved by the Civil Aviation Authority, which oversees all of our investments, but I believe it is the right thing to do and our regulator will agree.

## **VII. Transport**

With expansion, this area will be at the heart of an integrated transport network, with rail and road links to north, south, east and west, and the Commission has confirmed there will be no material change in the number of cars on the roads. Over 55% of passengers will come to the airport by public transport, compared to just over 40% today. The number of rail seats serving Heathrow will increase threefold. Crossrail will connect to the City and East London. A Piccadilly Line upgrade will offer better frequency and journey times. There will be western rail access for passengers from Slough, Reading and the Thames Valley as well as the South West and Wales. Southern rail access could connect Staines, Twickenham, Richmond, Clapham Junction and Waterloo. High Speed 2 will connect Heathrow to the Midlands and the North. We will also have the largest bus-and-coach station in the UK. Half of all car journeys to the airport are made by people who work here. Better rail links will reduce this, as will relocating offices and hotels close to the rail station at Terminal 5 and an extended free bus travel zone, making it easier for the new and existing local workers to come to Heathrow by bus.

## **VIII. Environmental Factors**

Heathrow's expansion should only go ahead within strict environmental limits on local air quality and within the UK's climate change targets. We have developed a plan which will deliver this. This includes providing incentives for people to use public transport, reducing staff car parking spaces and, if necessary, a congestion charge for people travelling to the airport by car. The Commission's analysis of road traffic and air quality emissions does not yet account for our

mitigation measures, but we are confident that once they have it will confirm that air quality limits can be met.

## **IX. What Happens if Heathrow Does Not Expand?**

### **1. Fewer Destinations**

Surely Heathrow could be better, not bigger. No. Without expansion, Heathrow will be able to do less for our region and for all of Britain. There is a price to not expanding that will be paid in lost jobs and lost opportunities for future generations. The world is changing. All the growth in the world is in Asia and the Americas, markets you can only get to by air from a hub airport like Heathrow. If Britain is going to win the race for growth, we need to be not only connected to these new markets but better connected than our European competitors. The Airports Commission analysis confirms that a do-nothing approach will actually lead to fewer destinations being served by Heathrow. We will be worse connected to the growth markets of the world while Britain's competitors in Europe and the Middle East become better connected and take the economic growth that could and should be ours.

### **2. Gatwick**

Gatwick will not get us there. Their solution is for Londoners to fly through Dubai to get to emerging markets. It is not good enough. For British businesspeople, that means longer journeys and higher costs to get themselves and their exports to global markets. A less-connected London will become less attractive for inward investors, tourists and students. International businesses are less likely to choose London as a base, and those that are here may start to leave. A world city needs to be connected to the world.

### **3. Fewer Jobs**

Businesses that do not expand also tend to employ fewer people. The Commission estimates that within 15 years Heathrow alone could employ up to 14,000 fewer people than today if there is no growth at the airport. Fewer jobs; fewer apprenticeships; less opportunity for children in the local schools today.

## **X. The Prize of Expansion**

There is a price for not expanding, but there is a significant prize to be won from expansion for West London, the Thames Valley and Surrey, and for Britain: up to £211 billion of economic growth and up to 180,000 new jobs across the UK and 70,000 jobs in our region. Heathrow will create jobs while we are building and when we have opened the new airport in 2025. This represents a step change in local employment in an area with tens of thousands out of work. Unemployment could be cut by 50% and youth unemployment in surrounding boroughs could end. We will work with schools, colleges and unions to give young people in the area the training and opportunities they need, doubling the number of apprenticeships across the airport to 10,000.

## **XI. Concluding Remarks**

For the last 60 years, our region and Britain have prospered by having the best-connected airport in the world on our doorstep. By building on the strength of Heathrow, we can still be the winners in the race for growth, securing the prosperity we have enjoyed for future generations. Let us be ambitious. Let us work together to deliver the economic growth our region and Britain needs in a sustainable way and ensure those who are most impacted by expansion get the greatest benefits and are treated fairly. Let us make the right decision by expanding Heathrow and ensure that future generations enjoy the opportunities we have. Let us be ambitious. Thank you.

### **Captain Jock Lowe**

**Director, Heathrow Hub Limited**

#### **I. Preamble**

I am going to go through a few slides. I will rush through them and obviously you can talk to me at coffee or lunch if you want to follow it up. The slides do not include a picture of Nigel Farage in the air crash in his little aeroplane. I missed a trick there.

First of all, I want to thank Sir Howard and his team of commissioners and his secretariat. An immense amount of work has gone into this. It is truly amazing. I do not agree with all that they have published, but that does not mean that they have not done a fantastic amount of work. I agree with most of it. Well done to all of you. The other thing is, 'It is a battle with Heathrow'. It is not; it is a skirmish. The big battle is to get a runway at all and to make sure it is not at Gatwick, for reasons I will talk about.

#### **II. Heathrow Hub**

People have asked me what Heathrow Hub is. It was just four individuals. Three of us are actually here today. We just came up with a proposal that we put into the Commission. I thought that was the end of it, but little did I know. Now, 18 months or two years later, it is nearly full-time. It is great fun, but it is also very important. We got some funds to carry on and we even have some funds for advertising, if you saw the *Standard* last night.

#### **III. Why is Heathrow Important?**

I agree with everything that John has said about the importance of Heathrow. It is a transport hub for the UK. With the various plans in place, 75% of the population will be within two and a half hours of Heathrow. What does it do? It gives the people of the UK a chance to connect with the world, be it for business, travel, tourism or visiting friends and relations. It is basically for us in the UK. What it also does is it gives access for visitors from the rest of the world to come to us – the ones that we want. This is why I agree that there maybe needs to be a fourth runway, but there probably does not, because there is a limit. There are only 60 million of us. 120 million journeys will be possible from Heathrow with a third runway. There is a limit to how much expansion you want. We do not all go flying all the time; there is a limit to how many people can come in. We



included the word 'hub' because it was originally a railway hub. It is not a hub for switching from long haul to long haul without people getting off; it is to get switching transfers for 30% of people, a lot of them from air routes within the UK.

#### **IV. Benefits of Expansion**

There are benefits of an expanded Heathrow. You have heard them from John:

- More choice.
- More jobs.
- More investment.
- More reciprocal rights can be offered.

When you think how many flights there are a week to Dubai or especially New York, what happens when there are two more places in China and India that need that many flights? Do you think they are just going to say, 'Yes, you can come. Take your short-haul aeroplanes off; put long-haul aeroplanes on?' They want to have reciprocal rights. They want to bring their airlines into Heathrow. They do not want Gatwick. Gatwick's average fare, as far as we can see, is £120; Heathrow's is £400. That shows the difference in business model and the difference in choice that is being made by the airlines.

#### **V. What If We Do Not Expand Heathrow?**

##### **1. Fewer Jobs**

John has mentioned it, but job numbers will go down. Productivity, efficiency – robots will reduce the number of jobs. There will be less investment. There will be less international business. Let me just say a quick word about that. I grew up in a little mining village in the North East. We were surrounded by heavy industry: coal; ship-building; iron and steel; and heavy engineering. Because there was no investment, because we all thought, 'Well, it is okay; it will just stay here', in half a generation those jobs disappeared. Now, Nissan, for instance, have built a factory there that has the highest productivity of any Nissan factory in the world, but they need to connect through London to get to China and Japan and the rest of the world.

##### **2. Bigger Aeroplanes**

The other thing that will happen is the airlines, if there is no expansion at Heathrow, will start to put on bigger aeroplanes. They will consolidate short-haul routes and use the bigger aeroplanes. There will be pressure on night-quota flights. There are 16 flights at the moment; there will be pressure to increase them. There will be more pressure to stop mixed-mode limitations, which cuts down capacity by about 15-20%. The airlines will try to change that. If Gatwick expands, I can tell you where their first long-haul routes will be. They will be Chicago, New York, Washington, Miami and Dubai. That is where the expansion will go.

## **VI. The Heathrow Hub Proposal**

Our plan is simply to extend the northern runway and then put a safety zone in the middle so you can land on one half and take off on the other half. Reverse it and you can do the same. There are a number of advantages. It is simple, it takes fewer houses and it is safe. I have maintained from the beginning – and people are starting now to agree with me – that it is the safest of all the options. All the options that have been put forward to Sir Howard and his commissioners are safe, but this is, I would argue, the safest. It is simple, it is cost-effective, there is less land taken than all the other plans, there are no villages that need to be taken out and there is no necessity to change the noise footprint.

## **VII. Noise**

### **1. Quieter Aeroplanes**

But let me talk about noise briefly, because that is the important thing. If aircraft were silent, I do not think there would be an issue. They are not, and they will not be for a long time. There is no difference between our two plans on noise. With modern aeroplanes, [you can fly over the people that you want?]. The same number of aeroplanes flying over the same rough population; the two plans will make the same noise. Both ideas rely to reduce the noise on the use of modern techniques and equipment. It is on most of the aeroplanes now. We will have new aircraft and they are quieter. If you have heard the 787, it is quieter. After 2020, all new aeroplanes that come into Heathrow have to be of that type.

### **2. Early-Morning Landings**

Our new runway is even further west than the Heathrow one. It is certainly further west: two and a half miles. We take two and a half miles of people out of the noise footprint early in the morning. We can improve the operating techniques and we can do what I call sophisticated respite. Let me talk, though, first about early-morning noise. That is what you can get with the night-quota flights between 04.30 and 06.00. However, I do pose the question: do we need any of those night-quota flights at all? You could actually get rid of them, but, for the airlines to have a chance, you have to make far more slots available after 06.00. Even then there are difficulties: leaving Hong Kong or Singapore at a reasonable time and not getting in here at 04.30 or 05.00 can be done, but it is difficult. I can assure you the airlines will fight to keep those until there is some viable opportunity to compensate for the loss. With that, you can see that the green says where the noise will be if you land with new aeroplanes on the deep runway.

### **3. Respite**

This is the simplistic version. The four red lines going into the runway are the approach paths that we can do with modern aeroplanes. You can have eight hours' respite. You could have a few more flight paths. Say you have eight flight paths in so you have 12 hours of respite, except for the last part of the approach, which is where mitigation and compensation will come in. That is how it looks in a 3D picture. Those curved approaches are what can be flown by all the aeroplanes. It is what, actually, we were flying on the departures not long ago. They were trying out this equipment. On departures you need dispersion – you need the aeroplanes to climb quicker, but that is possible. On arrivals you need concentrated respite that you then move around. All that will mean, in

summary, is that even with more aeroplanes people for most of the approach over London will actually have fewer aeroplanes more of the time.

Ground-based augmentation system (GBAS) is where you use sophisticated satellites. On this diagram you will see steep approaches are in, and curved approaches. Why have I shown that? Use of GBAS. Due to the more flexible approach-path adaptation, noise-reduced approaches are possible, avoiding flying over densely-populated areas. This is not from me; it is not from London. It is from Frankfurt. Just look at the date: September 2014. They have started to do it. They are using GBAS approaches. Chicago has just published GBAS approaches. These are satellite-type approaches. It is not futuristic thinking that might happen; it is actually happening now. They have already identified it. That is why I have left the Frankfurt logo on at the top. The fourth paragraph: 'Realisation of curved approaches at peak time to fly around densely populated areas'. This is just a way of saying it is all possible. We can and will, and we should, make less noise. The airline industry has really not put as much effort into approach noise as they should. We can reduce it a lot.

## **VIII. Transport**

We have thought about roads and railways. We have a different plan to Heathrow. Either plan would work with either option. The orange area at the top is where we propose a station over the Crossrail and Great Western main line and a four-minute link with a transit into the airport. It is also a huge car park. It seems to make sense to take the traffic congestion away from the airport. It would, however, mean that there would be some changes to the local roads – that is inevitable – but there would not be any disruption to the M25. It might close a few lanes overnight, but there is no massive disruption. We would obviously also, no matter which plan went ahead, have to sort out the waterways. I have a house in Colnbrook. The water got that close to the doorstep, so I am aware of the water issues. In fact, technically, that is probably a bigger problem than building the runway. Railways too we would connect. That is a plan where you connect to Heathrow through the south – through Staines down to Waterloo – and you could also extend the railways down parallel to the M25 and make a link down to Woking.

## **IX. Video**

There is now a two-minute video and that is the end of my presentation. This animation says in two minutes what I have said in 12 minutes.

[Video shown]

That was a little bit of PR. Thank you very much for listening.

[Applause]

## **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you very much. Can I invite the Members of Parliament to come up? Zac Goldsmith is the first up, though will not be the first to speak, I do not think; then we have John McDonnell from Hayes and Harlington and Fiona Mactaggart from Slough. We had hoped also to have Seema Malhotra from Feltham and Heston but she is not able to be with us. The order agreed in complex

negotiations involving the United Nations, I think, at times is that John will speak first, Zac, then Fiona Mactaggart. Over to you. Thank you.

## **MPs' Statements**

**John McDonnell**

**Member of Parliament for Hayes and Harlington**

### **I. Preamble**

No negotiations and no United Nations, I assure you. Can I just say by way of introduction that I am here really more in sorrow than in anger? Can I say to Mr Holland-Kaye I am grateful for Heathrow's apology this morning? Can I also say that after every expansion of Heathrow we have had the same apology as a community? Every time.

[Applause]

Whatever you feel about the expansion of Heathrow, there comes a time now when we have to have honesty. Of every expansion, we have been told as a community, just so you know, that there would be no further expansion. I have been in this area for 40 years. I have represented in Parliament my constituency for 17 years. Before that, I was a GLC councillor. I held my first meetings about Heathrow in the early 1970s. I have been at every hearing, I have been at every planning application inquiry, and at every one we have been told, 'If we get this expansion, that will be the limit'. On the last occasion, in a hotel like this, a letter was read to us saying, 'We do not need and we will not seek a third runway'. With the greatest respect to Mr Holland-Kaye, I am sure as an individual he means what he says, but as a corporate body Heathrow Limited and BAA before it just cannot be trusted.

[Applause]

I want to be brief. I want to raise a number of questions and not make points, if I can. These are questions that have come from my constituents, who have waded through the documentation as best they can, although I want to congratulate the Commission for the work it has done. This is the first time we have had this detailed appraisal in this way. In addition to that, this is the first time any commission has actually looked at issues around quality of life and community. I commend Sir Howard Davies and his colleagues for doing that.

### **II. Housing**

Let me go through some of these questions. The question from my constituents whose homes are going to be affected is: 'Where will we go?' We were told first of all the numbers at risk started at about 300. They then went to 783, then plus another 289. That was about 3,000 who would lose their homes. We were then told there would be others affected by the A4 relocation. Now Heathrow Limited have come up with a compensation scheme that actually comes near to the figure

we ourselves predicted, which is 4,000 homes which will either be demolished or rendered unliveable so that people will want to move. That is nearly 8-10,000 of my constituents. This will be the largest forced removal of a community in our peacetime history. Where will they go?

In May of this year the housing waiting list for Hillingdon Council – Councillor Puddifoot will be speaking later – was 12,000. The council is housing only about 700 families a year. The private market in our area has a limited supply in future years, which was revealed by the site survey by the council in its consultation on our local plan. Like-for-like properties – in other words, in the Heathrow villages, houses with gardens – are almost impossible to find within the local area. Where will they go? Where will they be accommodated? To be frank, to come up with a proposal without identifying the solution is just not acceptable.

### **III. Schools**

Our communities are living, breathing, thriving communities. They comprise all the elements of a living community; schools and nurseries. As a result of these proposals, Harmondsworth Primary School and the Harmondsworth and Longford nurseries will be demolished. Heathrow Primary School, to be frank, will also be rendered unteachable. We will lose two primary schools, and possibly three. Where will our children go? We have just gone through – the council will explain this to you – an expansion of our education system in the south of the borough. We are desperately seeking places. We have expanded virtually every local school. The council, despite bitter opposition from the local community, has been forced to build on green belt for the first time in its history to accommodate a new school. Where will we go? Where will our children be taught in the future? Where will the replacement schools and the replacement nurseries be located? There has been no showing of the sites that are available, because there are none.

### **IV. Green Spaces**

You will also see in the documentation an identification of the land that has been taken – our parks and our green belt. It includes Sipson recreation ground, our community centre and parts of Colne Valley Regional Park. It has been blithely promised in the community impact assessment these will be relocated. I just ask the simple question: where? Land is in desperate short supply in this part of the area. It is designated for housing, largely. Where are the sites available for relocation of our open spaces and our country park areas? Are brownfield sites to be converted? Where are these sites? I have scoured the maps. We have looked at the maps for alternatives and it is impossible to find. We have already our open space or green belt and I cannot see this being expanded under these proposals, because there are no options that have been brought forward.

### **V. Community Cohesion**

The issue that has been brought forward for the first time by the Commission – and I congratulate it for it – is the examination of community cohesion. It is the first time in any assessment of airport expansion it has been looked at. We have a sense of community – a sense of place – grown over generations in our villages and settlements, which have existed not just for centuries but, in the case of Harmondsworth, for 1,000 years. Families have lived together for generations. This is a traditional Middlesex village. So is Harlington. So is Londford. So is Sipson. They still exist: the church; the school; the green; the pub; the village hall. Names of families enjoined together on its war memorial. These are all irreplaceable.

In the document on community impact it says: 'At the very local level, it is difficult to see any existing community cohesion being maintained unless entire communities and their facilities were moved en masse at the same time'. That is impossible, and this document accepts that. Where is the land for that? Where is it possible to actually overcome the destruction of a community like that? Is it not just dishonest to even hold out that prospect?

## **VI. Environmental Issues**

To be frank, we already live in an area where air pollution is at the edge of or exceeding European limits. How can it be that an increase in the aircraft movements and the expansion of passenger numbers, vehicle movements and freight movements cannot make air pollution worse? It is just not credible to argue so. There is a proposal that there will be mitigation measures. Why are those mitigation measures not in place now when in our area we lose 80-100 people who die each year as a result of air pollution and 3,000 across London?

[Applause]

How can anyone tolerate a worsening of this situation?

## **VII. Noise**

Noise similarly. What assurances can be given to local residents currently affected, but especially those not affected currently by noise, when flight paths are so uncertain and not definitive at present? What happens in the future, on both air pollution and noise, if the assurances given today are not adhered to? On air pollution, does Heathrow Airport suddenly close for a few days until the air improves? Does Heathrow Airport stop flying because they have gone beyond the noise limits? Of course not. We will be trapped in an environment which is polluted and noisy, with no recourse to action.

## **VIII. Health**

Let me just say that constituents have expressed to me that the assessment of the health implications of airport expansion have been limited. What in-depth studies are to be commissioned to establish the health implications of expansion? Is there to be, as we asked for, an independent, open public inquiry into the health implications of expanding Heathrow? The consequences for residents living near the airport and people working at the airport are absolutely critical in health terms.

## **IX. Deliverability**

Let me just say this finally. The Commission has looked at the whole range of factors on deliverability – the issues around air pollution, environment, economic impact, etc. – but I think there are other factors as well. One of them is political deliverability. First of all, let me just make this straight. I do not believe in party politics in the west of London any party is going to risk the range of marginal seats that there is in the area. There has not been a candidate elected in a marginal seat in West London proposing expansion of Heathrow Airport; in fact, all of them have stood on tickets of opposition to expansion. That includes local council candidates as well. Also, I have to say although climate change may not be a critical issue at the moment because of the economic recession, it will grow again. I believe that climate change and the impact on climate

change of Heathrow Airport will be one of those factors that will be taken into account more readily in these coming months as we move towards a general election.

Can I say this as well? Do not underestimate the depth of anger that there is in my community. Do not underestimate the depth of anger that there will be if there are proposals to expand Heathrow Airport. We have been lied to by Heathrow Airport over the years, but I have to also say politicians have not been honest with us either. Before the last election, there was no caveat that the commitment of ‘no ifs, no buts’ was only for the life of a Parliament. Last time we had Heathrow threaten expansion, Climate Camp turned up and there was a direct action campaign. You have seen some of that today. Let me just say this. I think if there are proposals to go ahead with Heathrow Airport, Heathrow will be the iconic battleground not just for our local communities to fight for their villages but for the community across London, this country and maybe Europe to campaign against climate change. I do not believe this is deliverable. In fact, our community will make sure it is not deliverable. If that comes by political action or direct action, be assured we will be there.

### **Zac Goldsmith**

#### **Member of Parliament for Richmond Park**

## **I. Heathrow Airport’s Campaign**

Thank you, Sir Howard, for this opportunity. It is a real pleasure to follow John, whose every word I agree with. I just want to very briefly comment on the campaign that Heathrow has waged. As a company, you have channelled fortunes into a front group – a bogus community group – called Back Heathrow even though you have publicly stated that you disagree with its core message that the choice is between expansion of Heathrow and the decline and eventual death of Heathrow. You are essentially funding the dissemination of information which you believe to be misleading. Worse than that – this is relevant particularly for this area we are in today – you have funded a campaign which has targeted elected representatives – the elected Leader of Hillingdon Council, for example – just before the local elections. In effect, this giant, foreign-owned corporation has sought to pervert the democratic outcome.

[Applause]

I would like to hear you publicly defend that when you respond to us. I am not expecting an answer, but I would also like to know how much you have spent on this unprecedented propaganda blitz that we have seen over the last few months. For the record, I understand why Heathrow is waging this campaign. Heathrow wants the public to fork out vast subsidies in order to facilitate a near-monopoly which Heathrow will own. I dread to think what strings Heathrow is pulling behind the scenes in the Department for Transport, for example, where it has always enjoyed privileged access to decision-makers.

## **II. The Case Against Expansion**

### **1. Changing Trends in Travel**

For the record, I do not advocate the closure of Heathrow. My view is that it should not expand, and I am going to explain why. The case for a centralised mega-hub is evaporating. It is evaporating not least because travel is changing. Transfer traffic across Europe has been declining for years because of the advance in technology and because of the rise in low-cost carriers, while point-to-point trips are increasing. Across London, I believe only 14% of passengers are transfer passengers, a figure that is expected to fall as more use is made of Middle Eastern hubs – for example, Dubai. In addition, according to the DfT, business flights have been decreasing. In 2000, the percentage of business passengers was 38%; in 2005 it was 35%; by 2010 it was 30%. There is nothing to suggest these trends are going to change. We are told, for example, that there will be a 900% increase at London airports in the next decade of new, smaller and more fuel-efficient aircraft capable of flying direct to long-haul destinations. Clearly, this is going to have a transformative impact on flying in this country – the whole economy.

### **2. The Need for Competition**

The alternative to cobbling back together a vast, foreign-owned monopoly on one edge of our giant city is to facilitate a super-competitive network, with our three main airports all competing for customers. Above all, that means investing in better surface links. Like in all sectors, competition encourages innovation, it encourages adaptation to new technologies, it encourages choice and it usually provides a better deal for customers. I do not think anyone would pretend that Gatwick has not become a much, much better airport since it was liberated from the monopoly. That is why the Competition Commission recommended that the former BAA monopoly should be broken up. An expanded Heathrow would represent a step backward. It is the telegram solution in the internet age. It would enable Heathrow to cherry-pick the best customers and the best flights and its competitors would struggle. The effect could be both a net decrease in capacity – I think that was the view in a leaked report from NATS, although I have never seen the report itself, only reports in the newspapers – as well as Heathrow itself reaching capacity far sooner than has been anticipated in these discussions.

For my part, I have to say I am not convinced by the case for expansion anywhere, but I do not pretend to be an expert of predict-and-supply. Whatever solution is sought, surely that solution should maximise, not suffocate, competition. It is worth pointing out briefly in response to Heathrow's, and particularly Back Heathrow's, scare stories that London is already well connected and well served. We have six airports and seven runways, more than any of our European rivals. Heathrow has more flights to business destinations than any other airport in Europe, more than the combined total of Charles de Gaulle and Frankfurt. If you look at Heathrow's connectivity to China, ranked by cities in relation to their GDP, Heathrow has vastly more. More people come in and out of London than any other city in the world, not just Europe.

### **3. More Direct Flights**

We are told that we need a mega-hub principally to maintain routes to low-demand destinations. That is a core argument in favour of having this huge centralised hub, but that is not what is happening. For example, New York is one of Heathrow's most frequent routes, but nearly 30% of passengers to New York are transfer passengers. Their contribution to our economy is negligible. I



do not think anyone would suggest that those passengers are necessary to keep that New York route open. I believe most of Heathrow's transfers are on the most popular routes, which would obviously, therefore, survive without those transfers. Providing passengers with more direct routes and reducing transfers could free up up to 30 million additional passenger places per year at Heathrow. I have no doubt that if anyone were to bother to ask the passengers themselves they would say overwhelmingly they prefer to fly point-to-point. I was pleased that the consultation report of the Davies Commission acknowledged that our economy would benefit from a network approach almost as much as the monopoly approach. If that is true, it would be very hard indeed, as John has just alluded to, in a democracy to justify pushing ahead with the option that will harm people the most. Be in no doubt: it would, on many levels.

### **III. Costs of Expansion**

#### **1. Surface Transport**

I want to look very briefly at the costs of Heathrow expansion. The Commission has already said that Heathrow has massively underestimated the costings around the expansion. As it happens, I believe, with all respect, that the Commission itself has as well, in particular in relation to surface transport links. Given that Heathrow's CEO has admitted in front of a panel of MPs that a successful third runway could necessitate a fourth, these considerations are absolutely paramount. The third runway as proposed by the last Labour Government would have led, we are told, to an additional 25 million road passenger journeys, so it is very hard to imagine how our already over-congested roads are going to be able to cope with this extra traffic. In the medium term, during construction, how can Heathrow possibly divert the M25 and the A4 and carry out works to other minor roads within the same timeframe without causing absolute mayhem for years? What is the cost of that disruption to the economy? Has anyone even assessed that cost? Is it right for the public to pay those costs not once but twice – for the actual improvements themselves and then through a substantial congestion charge in order to limit the damage to West London's economy by minimising congestion? I do not know if the Airports Commission has assessed the transport implications of a third runway on the roads in the vicinity of Heathrow – on local roads in adjacent boroughs – but if not, it is hard to see how this process can be meaningful. I strongly urge the Airports Commission to commission Transport for London, which is uniquely placed to do this work, to come up with a cost/benefit analysis of what all this actually means in terms of the minor and ancillary roads.

#### **2. Noise**

Then there is the cost of noise. It is hard to quantify but even harder to ignore. Heathrow already had a bigger impact on people's quality of life by many multiples than any other airport in Europe. Heathrow Airport by a huge margin is the largest noise polluter in Europe. It already affects over 750,000 people. No other country in Europe allows that level of disturbance. I believe Schiphol, the airport which is always described as its main hub competitor, affects 16 times fewer people than Heathrow does. The World Health Organisation has been clear for years about the dangers of this level of noise: aggressive behaviour; stress hormones; high blood pressure; antisocial behaviour; hindering child development – the list goes on and on and on.

I note that Heathrow has proposed various methods for reducing noise – steeper approaches, concentrated flight paths, and so on and so forth – and they may have a marginal impact, but if Heathrow really wants us to believe that an increase from 480,000 movements to 740,000

movements will lead to a reduction of noise then I suggest that the rest of Heathrow's pitch should be taken with a very generous pinch of salt. It is worth pointing out that there was nothing stopping the airport bringing these measures in without a third runway, and I am interested to know why these promises are linked only to the prospect of a third runway.

I also want to point out some figures in Heathrow's and the Airport Commission's national noise assessment, which suggests that the north-west runway, while potentially removing 250,000 people from the noise contour, would actually result in 320,000 new people being brought into it. These are people who have never had to experience the disturbance that my constituents and John's constituents have had to deal with. These are people who have no idea [inaudible] –

[Applause]

I would like to know in policy terms what weight should be attached to these people who are yet to be affected and on the whole do not even know it.

#### **IV. Politics**

Finally, I want to talk about the politics and the process. There is a profound dishonesty in this debate. I am not going to rehash the arguments that John has just made about prior promises. He has made the point and I agree with him. There is a dishonesty in today's debate. We are discussing a third runway today but we know that a successful third runway will give rise to a fourth runway. The CEO has more or less said so himself, in words which were not that ambiguous, to a panel of MPs just a few months ago. More importantly even than that, there is no clear information yet on the proposed new flight paths. There are hundreds of thousands of people in London whose lives will be turned upside down and they do not even know it. That is simply not acceptable in a democracy. I must say that even while Heathrow will attempt to downplay that information, for obvious reasons, we, the campaign groups – many people in this room; I see HACAN represented here and other organisations as well – will make sure that people who stand to be affected are made aware of the threats they face. The campaign that we saw last time round, which was the biggest campaign we have ever seen in relation to a major development project, will look trivial compared to the campaign we can expect if a green light is given to Heathrow expansion. As John said, it will be the pin-up – the iconic campaign – and we will win it.

I just want to make one point to the Airports Commission itself. We do, thankfully, live in a democracy. Governments can make grand declarations and grand promises, but they cannot deliver those promises without some form of consent. A third runway might well be possible in a tyrannical regime of some sort, but no one who understands the politics of this issue, no one who understands the wider community, is under any illusion. This project cannot, and it will not, be delivered. Thank you.

**Fiona Mactaggart**  
**Member of Parliament for Slough**

## **I. Consultation Process**

Thank you very much, Sir Howard, and thank you for inviting me. I share John's praise for your Commission's quality of work compared to previous consultations about this, but I have to say I am very sad about one thing about today, which I particularly wanted to raise. Slough Borough Council has not been invited to make representations here. I think that is very sad, as Slough Borough Council is the only new area where land is being taken by both of these proposals. The MP for that area, Adam Afriyie, is also not on the panel, so the people of Colnbrook and Poyle, who are going to be directly affected by both of these plans, are not being represented here. I do not represent Colnbrook and Poyle, although I represent the rest of Slough. My sense is that your invitation list is more looking back to the history of people who have been concerned about the impact of Heathrow in the past than looking forward to the impact of these proposals on their local communities. I specifically would ask the Commission to go and visit Colnbrook and Poyle and to go and speak to Slough Borough Council, because I think that the voice of those people has to be heard and unfortunately, based on the invitations that have been issued to organisations here, it is not going to be. I know that Slough Borough Council would welcome you to have a visit, and I think that it is very important that that occurs, because I think without it there will be flaws in the consultation process.

## **II. Importance of Heathrow to Slough**

I have to be honest: I am not a technician. I do not have huge research resources. In fact, if the council was here, you would probably get a much clearer analysis of the impacts of both of these proposals than I have the capacity to do. I do not have staff who can do this kind of research. But I have to say I know how important Heathrow is to the town that I represent. I start from the belief that the UK does need a world-leading airport.

When I was first elected in 1997 Heathrow had more destinations as well as more passengers than most of its European rivals, and that lead is beginning to slip. But it depends on surface transport as well as air transport, and on the airport being a neighbour that people are prepared to live and work beside. That is why, when the Labour Government proposed a new runway, I refused to back it until – I did back it eventually – I had won a commitment to support electrification of the Great Western railway, because without that it would be impossible to get rail links into the airport. It seems to me that one of the critical questions which both of the promoters must ask is: is western rail access compatible with their proposals, and is it a direct access into the airport or access outside it? I think the impact of these proposals on surface transport has to be very carefully analysed.

Our lead in international connectivity has big impacts for the UK economy. Slough, the nearest town to Heathrow, is a magnet for inward investment to the UK. We have more European headquarters of multinational companies than Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland put together, and when I talk to the bosses of those companies they tell me it is because of the accessibility which Heathrow provides them to their international networks. But they are concerned that if our airport loses its top billing or becomes harder to use, they will move. They will choose to give up the attraction which Britain, with its English language, high skills and membership of the EU, offers

them, to other countries where property is less expensive and connections to the world are easier. These are issues that really need to be addressed as we look forward.

### III. Stacking

We do have more passengers than other places now, but we also treat them extraordinarily badly in the air. I do not have huge technical resources, as I said, and so I rely on a report in the *Daily Telegraph* which tells me that in 2010, the last year for which statistics are available, 120,426 of the 224,497 incoming flights to Heathrow were held in a stack. That is half of them. Those stacking aircraft cause delays for business arriving here but also poison our air and add to noise.

[Applause]

I want to know from the promoters of these proposals what difference this arrangement makes about stacking aircraft. I have not heard any guarantees about an end to stacking from either of the promoters. What guarantees are they going to give to end stacking? NATS itself says that these delays, which cause business confusion and so on, are not only operationally difficult but they also cause environmental damage. I think we need to address that issue, which has not been addressed yet.

### IV. Transport

Getting on and off the airport can be a huge challenge with no rail link to the west and roads which are extremely congested. It will not take much for Heathrow to lose its top billing if you cannot get on and off the airport. While some strategic links might be beyond the scope of the Commission's inquiry, what proposals do the plans of the promoters have to improve access by near neighbours to the airport? I see plans for linking up with HS2 and so on, but one of the things that is really striking is that Terminal 5 changed the number of people living in Colnbrook who work at the airport. It used to be 4,000 Slough residents working at the airport in 2008; directly, in 2013, it is 5,000. I believe that that increase was partly because Terminal 5 is absolutely on our doorstep. Near neighbours need to be able to get onto the airport.

10 days ago I tried to come to the airport to get the Heathrow Express back into London, where I needed to go, after a conference in Poyle, and I was given a lift, very handily, by the Chief Executive of Slough Borough Council. The traffic was not very bad. It was a Thursday evening, quite late. I could have walked to the airport faster than we could get onto the airport, and I was travelling by car.

There are no bicycle links from that western area of Slough into the airport. What are the proposals to actually mean that the people who are you depending on to work at the airport, who live next door to the airport, who, as John said, need to have the most benefits from the airport, can actually get here to use the jobs? There is a real problem about local connectivity in all of the proposals. I hope, Sir Howard, your commission will deal closely with that issue. If we want to make the airport sustainable, it needs to be possible for people to get to the airport in reasonable ways – not adding to pollution, not adding to congestion, not adding to car parking but by bicycle and bus, although our bus routes – thank you, Heathrow, for subsidising them – do go round and round in circles and take a long time to get into the centre of Slough.

## **V. Noise**

Noise has been an important issue for everyone who has talked here. When I speak to my constituents about noise, the absolute prime issue is the importance of noise breaks; it is the value of runway alternation and making sure that they are not constantly affected by noise. There have been recent trials in which landing and take-off have happened on the same runway and I have had specific objections to the impacts of landing and take-off on the same runway. I want to know whether the proposals of either of the promoters will increase the number of landings and departures from the same runway.

Noise mitigation will also need to be substantially extended to the west. Is anyone informing people who will be newly affected by the new noise contours – actually, where I live in Slough is one example of an area which will be newly affected – how they will be affected and what the impact is? Will they guarantee proper noise mitigation for not only individuals but also institutions? One of the things that I know happens in primary schools that are affected by noise and that have noise mitigation – I am sure John will be clear about this, because he has more primary schools which are directly affected at present – is, because they cannot open the windows, they then have huge air-conditioning bills in hot summers. Are those kinds of bills going to be able to be dealt with when there are mitigation procedures? Can we get a cast-iron guarantee that there will be respite periods through runway rotation and not constant landing and take-offs from the same runway? Will there be noise-preferential routes away from dense Slough populations who have not experienced noise previously?

## **VI. Slough Railway Station**

Have either of the promoters conducted studies of the impact on Slough railway station of their surface-access proposals? I am quite concerned that some of these will damage our commuter trains. I said that Slough is as successful as it is in attracting jobs because of its connectivity, and Heathrow is part of that connectivity, but actually, we also depend on good-quality rail services. A major international company has just left Slough to move to central London quoting in part one of the things that would have kept them in Slough as fast trains every 15 minutes to Paddington. We have failed to deliver that. In fact, the bit of transport that has got significantly worse since I have been MP for Slough – I was elected in 1997 – is the fast trains through our station. What is the impact of the rail proposals that are before us? I know that the Heathrow Hub rail proposal is beyond the scope of this particular examination, but actually it is very significant to Slough, because if there is another major rail connection just three miles down the railway line, is Slough railway station going to suffer? My prediction is that it is and, therefore, some of the value that we get from being close to Heathrow will be taken away from us by not having as good connectivity in other ways. We really do need to make sure that there is no loss of train paths to Slough from any of these proposals.

## **VII. Employment and Housing**

I also want to know where the jobs will be. If you look at Frankfurt, much of the business in Frankfurt is conducted within the airport itself. I know why airport promoters want that to happen – because the money is spent within the airport; it is your plant that is used, and so on – but actually, if you are going to make that connectivity real to manufacturing industry and so on, it needs to be able to benefit the environment around the airport, not just inside the airport. I want a guarantee that these proposals do not just focus the business activity inside the airport without letting people

out. If that is the case, then that will harm Slough as a business hub and will mean that Slough joins enthusiastically with some of the opposition to any of these proposals, whereas in practice our town has generally said that we could conceive of supporting them. It is really important that the employment benefits really do reach local people.

Previous buildings at the airport have been constructed by migrant workers living in caravan parks. What commitments can you give that local people will have access to training and work here? The Heathrow Academy, which I welcome, has so far usually prepared people for low-level jobs in retail and security at the airport, etc. Can Heathrow be depended on to give apprenticeships in higher-level skills – to give people the opportunity to train in those construction skills and in some of the technical skills that the aircraft industry requires – or will it still be second-class jobs that our local people get trained in? Will workers who build the airport be local? How are they going to be housed? Will those houses, if they are brought in additionally, be available for local people? As John pointed out, there is a real problem of land in this area, and if we are going to build more housing in Slough it means that we are going to be going up, because there is not very much room to go out. We do need help to find land on which to build housing.

That also raises the issue of people whose homes are going to be destroyed. Colnbrook and Poyle are villages. There will be houses lost there. What permanent quality houses will be built, and where, to replace destroyed homes, by whom, and, again, how will the construction workforce be housed?

## **VIII. Air Quality**

A further concern is the impact of the development on air quality, which is so poor in this area. What impact will your plans have on air quality? John pointed out the excess deaths in his constituency. The same is true in mine. More passengers and particularly more ground vehicles. That is one of my deep concerns about this. The M4 is just about to be turned into what is called a ‘smart’ motorway. That means a lot more cars on it. The consequence of that is noxious emissions, which are poisoning the residents of Slough. We need to improve the access to the airport in ways which do not give those kinds of emissions.

## **IX. Impact on Slough Borough Council**

### **1. Incinerator**

One of the things that is going to be destroyed by these proposals is the incinerator to the west of Slough. Some people who are concerned about air quality will think that that is arguably a good thing, although this is a very modern incinerator which actually cleans its gases more effectively than many, and it has enabled Slough to bring to an end the use of landfill for local waste. If it ceases operation due to this development, what plans are there to construct an improved incinerator with fewer emissions, which can recycle as well as providing energy from waste? What consultations have happened about [the issue which?] will be managed during the construction phase? If the present incinerator is closed, then we will immediately have landfill, which we have managed to avoid over the last year.

## 2. Business Rates

This plan impinges on key employment land in Slough. One of the things that I have been able to find out is that previously, when Heathrow has expanded, so has Hillingdon. Actually, I think that the time for Hillingdon's unmitigated growth should come to an end. I think it is not inappropriate if we do have expansion for Slough to be a joint planning authority for Heathrow with Hillingdon. Slough is actually quite a dynamic planning authority. We have a planning zone which enables the largest trading estate in single ownership in Europe to thrive. If a small borough like Slough was to have a big chunk bitten out of it by Hillingdon, frankly I do not think we would have the economic base to be able to afford the services that my constituents depend on. Next year, Slough Borough Council will be spending in cash the same amount of money as they did 10 years ago. That is because of central Government cuts. If on top of that these proposals take away business rates from Slough and do not replace them with anything, what will happen is our schools, our housing, our roads and our older people's services will all be destroyed.

## X. Concluding Remarks

I have raised very practical issues here because I suspect that the Commission has to make a big decision about whether this is the right thing for the country. It might be, but if it is the right thing for the country, what we need to make sure is that these detailed issues which affect local communities and which can contribute to the work which Heathrow is capable of bringing into this country can actually properly be answered, carefully, extensively, and by listening to and working with local communities. Thank you.

## Responses

### Sir Howard Davies

Thank you very much for those three contributions. They were very firm points without even a hint of David Mellor type language in any of them. I wanted to respond very briefly first to one or two points made to the Commission and then I will get some responses from the promoters. Some points made we are aware of. There are always some new ones and some surprising things: a Labour MP quoting the *Daily Telegraph* as a reliable source is a new one. Otherwise, there were lots of very interesting points, and I just want to thank the three Members of Parliament for coming on a day when Parliament is sitting, which shows the importance they give to this issue.

In terms of the points for us, I am sorry about perceived Slough slight. We have seven local authorities speaking after lunch. It is difficult, but we will find a way of getting their views and getting the views of those communities.

On roads, yes, we are looking carefully at the impact on the local road system of the additional demand that would be created. On air quality, we have commissioned some further work on what is called dispersion modelling, which is looking at the impact on individual areas. In spite of the volume of consultation, which people have commented on, that bit is actually not quite there yet. There were some points you made about access to the airport that we will certainly also take into account.

I would like to try to structure things a little bit because we are tight on time. The detail points we will follow up with the scheme promoters and ensure that we get their responses from them, and we have taken careful notes of what you have said. Most of the points I think will inevitably fall to John Holland-Kaye to respond to, but let me just ask Jock if he could perhaps deal as briefly as he can with two points, one made by Zac Goldsmith about the changing trends in flying. Is this the wrong model because low-cost is growing, etc.? I think it would be very interesting to have your view on that. Secondly, since you have spent some period of your life flying planes in stacks, perhaps you could tell us what your view is on what could be done to mitigate that. Then I will come to John, who can perhaps deal with some of the issues, many of which, of course, apply to the way Heathrow is behaving now, so I think that is not really for Jock to deal with.

### **Captain Jock Lowe**

Dealing with stacking first, I think the lower airspace management plans, which are coming in in 2017, and the future airspace policies will attempt to eliminate stacking, at least at lower level, and move any stacks that are there out over the sea. Passengers do not like it; airlines do not like it. There are two reasons for it. One is that the winds change in the upper atmosphere so you do get bunching no matter how much you try to avoid it. The best way is to slow aeroplanes down en route; you just do flow control. That will become possible as we get more integrated with the rest of Europe, and indeed it is in the plans. The other thing is how you use up time to create a constant flow into Heathrow without going round in stacks. You just make the flight paths longer much higher up where you do not hear the noise on the ground. If you fly slower you use less fuel as well. There are plans to reduce dramatically holding. I personally think they could be improved even more, but it is obviously in everybody's benefit to do that.

This second point, about trends in flying, is a myth. They are about to start a flight, I think, from Birmingham to New York. We tried it on VC10s long ago. It will work now, but simply because the market to New York has been expanded. There are 30 flights a day from Heathrow. If you generate a market, you will get flights from other places. Dubai to Newcastle would not happen if there were not 200 flights a week from Heathrow to Dubai. While there are opportunities for more flights from local airfields, there are also more opportunities for flights from Heathrow, because any market that it wants to expand at the moment it cannot, so you put a bigger aeroplane on. In many cases the 787 and the A350, which is coming along, would be ideal aeroplanes to start from Heathrow to new markets – the BRIC countries in particular – and to put an extra frequency on to certain places where the demand is not big enough for a jumbo but is big enough for a 787. Actually, the reverse is true, rather than [inaudible].

As for low-cost long-haul, I do not see how you can do it. Staff costs are 12% of the running costs, so where do you save money? Aeroplanes? Fuel? En-route charges? Food? They are all much the same. It is not the same business model as there was in short-haul.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you. John, you probably noted about 43 points to deal with, but can I try to structure things a bit? John and Fiona in particular made the point about land availability and where people go. That is about the housing loss, which John particularly emphasised, but also open spaces, which he talked about too, and Fiona made similar points. Could you see how you can respond to that?



**John Holland-Kaye**

Yes. The first point to make is that Heathrow, as we all know, has grown up organically, a little bit at a time, and it is not the way that you would ever plan for an airport to sit within its communities. This is a chance to fix that: to find a better way of Heathrow linking in to local communities, putting businesses closer to where they ought to be and putting hotels closer to where they ought to be, so that we can reduce the number of cars on the road. The same applies with the opportunity for open spaces. Our master plan is at a fairly high level at the moment; we have filled in some of the detail but we have a lot more work to do over the coming years to make sure that we have something that really works. We cannot answer all of the questions that people might have yet, but we will work together to do so. Part of the master plan is that we have a 15-mile green ribbon around the airport which allows both the re-provision but also the connection between open spaces. Some of that is current open land that people can use; some of it is not – some of it is existing farmland. That will allow us to improve the amenities for local people. I am not suggesting for a moment that everything that is lost will be re-provided – we will do as much of that as we can – but we do have an opportunity to enhance and to make things better. The same applies for flood defences. That is another area that we can improve.

Let me talk about housing loss. We have identified 750 homes that would be lost with expansion, and we have, through the consultation we carried out, extended the offer to buy homes to just over 3,000 further homeowners who would be on the boundary of the new airport.

**Audience Member**

Sorry, it is not 3,000. It is 3,750.

**John Holland-Kaye**

So, in total, there are over 4,000 people who would be eligible for our home purchase. Where we buy homes that are not being demolished for the new airport, we would refurbish them and re-sell them in the open market. Some of the people who are losing their homes may take up that opportunity to stay in the local community; some people will want to move on.

[Heckling]

We will want to work with local developers to find new housing areas and there is significant house-building in the community. We know that that is happening in the Purple Parking site. We will work with local developers and local councils to make sure that we can provide homes for the people who lose their homes.

[Heckling]

**Sir Howard Davies**

What I heard you say was that this was an area where further work with the local authorities was necessary.

**John Holland-Kaye**

Yes, that is absolutely the case.

**Sir Howard Davies**

That is a clear [inaudible].

**John Holland-Kaye**

We cannot answer all questions at this stage, but, as we have been doing over the last year, we will continue to listen to the concerns – this is a very important issue – and we will work with local councils and see how we can best find a plan that works for local communities and local people and allows the benefits of expansion and mitigates the –

**John McDonnell**

With the greatest respect, you are blighting my constituents' homes now and you are not offering a solution.

[Applause]

**Sir Howard Davies**

Can I pick up on that question, which I think links to a broader point that John made and others made, which is: if there are these mitigation opportunities that you are talking about for the future, why are they not being done now? That I think was a strong theme.

**John Holland-Kaye**

Zac raised this question. Zac, I am not sure whether you were here when I gave my opening remarks, but I attended your All-Party Parliamentary Group, I listened to some of the concerns that were coming up there and, as I said I would, I have turned that into a plan. Last week I wrote to the chief executives of the 40 airlines who need to change their operating procedures along the lines that you and your colleagues had raised to ask them to do so, which includes flying to the continuous descent approaches, which was one of the issues raised; stopping the whistling noise from A320s, which involves a technical change to the planes; getting rid of the remaining noisiest category-three aeroplanes from the fleet; and having a standard point at which planes drop their landing gear, which is one of the big concerns that has been raised. We are taking action on those. I said I would, and I have done that.

[Heckling]

We have also taken action on some of the other things that have been raised. One of those was about completing the schools insulation programme. That will be completed by the end of February, and we will be completing the insulation programme by the end of the summer.

[Heckling]

**Sir Howard Davies**

The point about noise mitigation particularly was: 'You have given the new promises; why have they not been implemented in the past?'

**John Holland-Kaye**

The noise mitigation?

**Sir Howard Davies**

Yes, the noise mitigation plans that you have for schools, etc. I heard people saying, ‘It is fine to say that, but why has that not been done before?’

**John Holland-Kaye**

Many of these things we have been working on. Heathrow has been taking significant steps on both noise and on air quality.

[Heckling]

I heard your message about the need for us to take action on things we said we would do, and I have taken action.

**Sir Howard Davies**

Another area, which Zac Goldsmith raised, was about information on flight paths and when the clarity would be available about who would be affected. This does affect both proposals in slightly different ways, but perhaps I could ask Jock to comment on that.

**Captain Jock Lowe**

I will link in two parts. The commercial airline industry dropped the ball on approach noise. It has done an awful lot about departure noise; it is much less of an issue. There has not really been the incentive to do arrival noise, but we can do it. We must do it. We must make the conditions. I showed you a particular series of examples of flight paths. All that is only possible now because now most aeroplanes have advanced navigation equipment, and so we can disperse, we can concentrate, we can be higher and we can standardise the procedures where there has been no standardisation anywhere. It is not just here in London. This affects places around the world. It is an industry problem which is being tackled.

**Audience Member**

When?

**Captain Jock Lowe**

It is being tackled now.

**Zac Goldsmith**

I just want to come back, because I think the question was not about mitigation. We had that answer, and I will not come back on that now. The question was about the new flight paths: the

areas where people will be affected who are not currently affected. That information is not there at the moment, and it must be.

**Captain Jock Lowe**

This is a debate which has to be had. Instead of being –

[Heckling]

Well, you could not do the different flight paths before. Now it is possible. The debate is: is it better to spread the noise but have much lower frequency, or is it better to concentrate it down much narrower paths on the approach and make the sequencing that goes on further out? I cannot give you the answer. One of the starting points for our plan was that you, the politicians, said, 'No third runway and no new people in the noise envelope', so that is what we can do. It is not a third runway; it is just a longer runway, and you can have the same flight paths if you want. The other thing is that we can make noise much less of a nuisance by using the modern equipment which is on aeroplanes, which is only just coming in now.

**Sir Howard Davies**

John, do you want to comment on that?

**John Holland-Kaye**

Yes. We have published different options for airspace design, because we do have choices. As Jock says, we can maximise the respite for people; we can minimise the number of new people affected by noise. These are different choices, and through this process we need to decide what is the right solution. We do have choices about how we manage airspace and how we impact people. This is complicated. We need to work together to find the best balance of benefit and cost.

**Sir Howard Davies**

Before we break, can I just ask you to do –

[Heckling]

We are going to have that a little bit later on in the agenda, actually.

**Audience Member**

This is a public consultation.

**Sir Howard Davies**

Yes it is, and there is going to be that.

**Audience Member**

When is the public going to speak?

**Sir Howard Davies**

The public is going to speak in the next session, after the coffee break.

I am going to ask one more question before we break. John, Fiona made a number of points about business on the airport, and also particularly about use of local people in construction, apprenticeships, etc. I wonder if you could pick up that.

**John Holland-Kaye**

Yes. This is where I see there is a huge opportunity on a number of the points that Fiona raised: making it easier for people to get into the airport and making sure that businesses are based supporting the airport in the right locations. Particularly, this is a once-in-a-generation – probably longer – opportunity to make sure that local people get the skilled jobs that we need. Expanding Heathrow, just in terms of the jobs needed at the airport alone, will create up to 40,000 new jobs in a relatively short space of time. We have an opportunity over the next 10 years to make sure that we are working with primary schools and senior schools for the needs of the airport in the future, and working with universities such as Brunel and the University of West London to make sure that we are getting the higher-level skills brought in. There will be a range of highly-skilled jobs that will be needed, and we want to make sure that as many of those as possible are kept for local people. That gives as much back as we can to local communities and it makes sure that we can minimise the impact on cars on the road, because local people have houses; there are significant levels of unemployment and underemployment in the local area today, and we can get people into work by bus. There is a real win here.

We can do the same with construction. There will be around 12,000 jobs created while we manage this construction project. It will be one of the biggest construction projects in the UK, and we can work with our supply chain to make sure that skilled jobs are being trained up into local people. That was something that was successfully done with Crossrail. We have done that with Terminal 5. We can do more of that. That is the great advantage of having the opportunity to plan ahead for something that we will need in 10 years' time.

**John McDonnell**

Sir Howard, could I ask Mr Holland-Kaye to answer Zac's question, which is: will Heathrow Limited stop funding Back Heathrow?

[Applause]

**John Holland-Kaye**

Back Heathrow has 50,000 members. Local people –

[Cheering and applause]

I will not have them being –

**John McDonnell**

Could you answer the question whether you will stop funding Back Heathrow?

**John Holland-Kaye**

We will continue to make sure that their voice is heard. These are your constituents and Zac's constituents.

[Cheering and applause]

**John McDonnell**

Will you stop funding what is a corporate lobbying exercise portraying itself as a community organisation?

**John Holland-Kaye**

I will continue to make sure that your constituents have their voices heard. The silent majority has to be heard.

**John McDonnell**

Answer the question. Will you stop funding them? If they are a community organisation, let them stand on their own feet. Will you stop funding them?

**John Holland-Kaye**

We will continue to make sure that 50,000 local people have their voices heard.

[Heckling]

**Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you. I think the point has been clearly made. We are going to break until 11.30. We are going to start promptly, because we do want public contributions in that session. I want to thank the MPs for coming. The promoters are staying to answer further question, of course, but thank you very much to our three MPs.

[Break]

## **Community Groups**

**Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you very much. We want to start again as promptly as we can. As a number of people have said, we have an opportunity to hear from members of the public who are here. We are going to begin with three groups that are active in this area from different perspectives, with John Stewart from HACAN, Rob Gray from Back Heathrow and Christine Taylor from Stop Heathrow

Expansion. We are going to hear three interventions from them, a bit of response to their points from the Promoters, and then we will take some comments from members of the public. I hope there will be microphones at that point. First, John Stewart.

## **John Stewart**

### **HACAN**

Good morning, everybody. Again, I want to echo my thanks to the Airports Commission for staging this. In my presentation, I want to concentrate on two areas: one, jobs and the economy, and two, noise.

#### **I. Jobs and the Economy**

HACAN, which I represent, has always recognised the importance of Heathrow to jobs and the economy, both the West London economy and the wider economy. Equally, we recognise the third runway would boost the economy and create local jobs. It would be foolish to say otherwise. However, that is very different from saying that a third runway is essential for the health of London's economy. We do not believe it is, and for this reason: more passengers – businesspeople and tourists – terminate in London than in any other city in the world. They are attracted by what London has to offer: a thriving financial culture, famous tourist sites, etc. London is the magnet. In many ways, London is the hub. This has two key implications for the third-runway debate.

First of all, if it is the vitality of London that continues to draw businesspeople and tourists in ever-increasing and world-beating numbers, most of them will not worry which airport they land at. Their destination is London, not Terminal 5 or even a splendid new Terminal 2. The second implication is the huge numbers of people coming to London as a destination are likely to make commercially viable frequent flights to a wide range of destinations across the world. London, therefore, in our view, unlike perhaps somewhere like Amsterdam, is not reliant on transfer passengers to make the majority of those flights viable. That is the importance of London as the hub.

My second point under jobs and the economy is that while the Commission recognises a new runway will boost the economy and create jobs, it is so far uncertain by how much. It writes in its report, 'Differences in scale and pattern of demand growth across the Commission scenarios lead to a wide range of economic benefits.' The Commission estimates the economic benefits as follows: for a third runway at Heathrow, the economic benefits are estimated to range from £112-211 billion. For Heathrow Hub, the estimates are £101-214 billion. The estimates of jobs created by 2050 by Heathrow's third runway range from 64,000 to 180,000, and for Heathrow Hub from 54,000 to 164,000.

First of all, it is not necessarily at this stage a bad thing to have a range of scenarios, because it means that the Commission has commissioned different sorts of modelling in order to really test the exact number of jobs that might be created. Nevertheless, I think for its final report, the Commission I am sure recognises it will need to drill down further into these figures to come up with more exact figures for how much the economy would be boosted and the extent to which jobs would be created. Secondly, I suggest a pre-New Year's resolution for my Promoter friends. I am

going to urge you to resist the very human temptation to always use the highest range of the Commission's figures. I do exactly the same myself, but look on the bright side: if it is a pre-New Year's resolution, you may be able to break it in the new year. My main point is that, while jobs will be created, the figures are very uncertain at this stage.

## **II. Noise**

HACAN welcomes in principle the measures that have been outlined by both Promoters and by the Commission to reduce noise: quieter – or, as we prefer to say, 'less noisy' – planes, operational improvements and particularly respite periods. Indeed, as some of you here know, we have engaged over the last few years very constructively with Heathrow Airport to try to facilitate these measures. At HACAN we believe that these measures would be most beneficial if they were introduced at a two-runway Heathrow. The Commission's findings seem to bear that out. We are not convinced yet that a three-runway airport will be quieter than today's airport. The elephant in the room is the increase in the number of planes there will be with a third runway to over 700,000. Residents here from across London will testify it is the sheer volume of planes going overhead that disturbs people. These days it is not so much the noise of individual planes – though the quieter they are, the better – but the numbers. That is why I believe that over the past 10-15 years complaints have risen despite planes getting quieter, and complaints have risen not just in West London and in Berkshire but in other areas further away from Heathrow. In HACAN, the biggest number of complaints we have received over the last decade or so is from South and South East London, where suddenly the numbers are the problem. Recently problems have arisen in places like Teddington and so on with the trials. Again, whatever we think of the trials, it is the number of planes going overhead that has become the problem.

In many ways, if we are going to deal with noise, I think we have to recognise – and I suspect this is recognised by the airport, Heathrow Hub and the Commission – that flight numbers are the nub of the problem. That is at the very heart of concerns. At this stage, I am still to be convinced that over 700,000 flights squeezed into Heathrow will at the same time cut the overall noise levels. That is a challenge I will leave with both of you. Thank you very much.

**Rob Gray**

**Back Heathrow**

Thank you, everybody. Thank you, Mr Chairman and commissioners, for this opportunity to address the Airports Commission on behalf of the community group Back Heathrow. Back Heathrow is a local group of residents, businesses and community groups campaigning for Heathrow and for the communities that rely upon Heathrow flourishing. We are one of the UK's fastest growing campaigns, with more than 50,000 supporters, and we are growing bigger and stronger every day. Our supporters are from the boroughs around Heathrow Airport. They are real people.

[Heckling]



For people whose communities, livelihoods and family prospects depend on Heathrow thriving in the future, the stakes could not be higher. We are delighted to have the support of Heathrow Airport and Heathrow Hub.

[Heckling]

Yet we only really exist because of our thousands of supporters. They are our core and our strength, and they are the reason we are here today. Mr Chairman, through all of today's hearings, I have one simple request, and that is for you and the commissioners to remember this: the majority of local people in the boroughs around the airport want Heathrow to grow. This is not an assertion; it is a fact, and later on I will show you the evidence that proves this. It is time for another side to the Heathrow story, and one that is rarely told. A successful and thriving Heathrow is essential to the future of communities close to the airport. Every single local council would agree with this statement, with the possible exception of Richmond, home to Heathrow's most frequent flyers. Is Mr Goldsmith still here? No. He often does not listen to what we have to say. He says his piece and then goes. I am sorry he is not here to hear this. Heathrow drives the local economy, putting money in people's pockets and delivering huge benefits for businesses in the community.

You only have to listen to what local people say about the airport to understand the irreplaceable role it has in everyone's lives. One of our supporters, Mr Vincent[?] of Isleworth, said, 'I have seen Heathrow grow from a bunch of tents in 1947 to what it is today. Expansion was good for the local community then and it will be good for the local community now.' John and Catherine of West Drayton look to the future when they told us: 'This is no longer a one-sided issue as portrayed in the media. It is high time to give people like us a voice. Our young people need jobs, and this is their chance.' The local businesses are also speaking out, not just multinational giants but small companies like Global Logistics, employing 14 people, who are no longer prepared to stay silent. Owner Chris Black told us that Heathrow is 'the economic harbour of West London', and without it his business and the local area would be nothing. Hounslow Council often refers to the borough as the airport economy, and it is right to do so. 77% of Hounslow businesses surveyed by the chamber of commerce support expansion, and more than half are only located here because of the UK's hub airport. Even in Hillingdon, where Boris Johnson has found a new home, Hillingdon Chamber of Commerce found that three-quarters of its members backed Heathrow expansion.

What about the many local residents that support us? Why have 50,000 people from this previously silent majority finally made a stand? It is simple. With the important debate now under way, there is too much at stake. For too long, these local people have had minority groups claiming to speak on their behalf just because they live under a flight path. They have been wrongly adopted as people who are automatically opposed to expansion. They are not. In fact, huge numbers of our supporters live under the same flight paths, and they do support expansion. When writing about the campaign against Heathrow expansion, which, as we know, has been ongoing, HACAN's leader, John Stewart, a man I admire greatly, was moved to say, 'The response in West London continued to be disappointing. My nagging doubts remained about how important the issue was to the majority of people in West London.' John, you are right to have your doubts, but I am certain the majority of local people are not against Heathrow expansion. Residents have had to listen to people like Zac Goldsmith telling the world why local children should not have the opportunity to earn their way through decent jobs and apprenticeships at a growing and thriving Heathrow. What Zac said about Heathrow earlier, if I can respond, is disingenuous and wrong, and I would suggest that Gatwick probably wrote his speech. We are happy to take donations from residents, which we do, businesses and the airport and Heathrow Hub. We have been happy about that from the outset. Every organisation needs its funding. HACAN has received money from the Goldsmith trust, and

Stop Heathrow Expansion is funded by Hillingdon Council, whether you support expansion or not. We all have our crosses to bear.

When we launched this campaign in response to this demand, because plenty of people wanted their say – not just the airport – I was not prepared for the sheer passion of the so many people who want a bright future for Heathrow. There have been countless letters, emails and visitors to our office in Hounslow, through volunteers coming in to stuff envelopes, make posters and pick up the phones. I have heard many tales of how the airport has made such a difference to the lives of local residents, their families and their local community. It is not just purely a debate about the number of aircraft, about pollution or even about noise, although they are all extremely important and issues that the Commission are clearly looking at, and they are right to do so. It also about jobs, mortgages, apprenticeships. It is about pride in the past and hope for the future. These same people are now deeply concerned. Our supporters do not care about airline economic models or seat-mile yields, yet they know that if Heathrow is full to bursting, something has to give. The consequences are not acceptable. Jobs, prosperity and opportunities will begin to disappear over time. The Commission itself suggests that 14,000 job opportunities could be lost if Heathrow is not allowed to grow. However, a new runway here means the creation of tens of thousands of local jobs and apprenticeships.

Mr Chairman, I said at the start that our campaign represents the true views of many local people, and we can prove it. One good example of this, in the time allowed, is the independent Populus poll that surveyed 10,000 local people in the boroughs surrounding the airport. It uses the same methodology that is universally accepted for all independent political polls. The poll was one of the largest ever undertaken on the issue, though it was far from the first. Nine out of the 10 areas polled showed more residents supporting expansion than opposing it. Local people in Slough, Windsor, Ealing, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Spelthorne and Hammersmith are overwhelmingly in favour of a bigger and better Heathrow. Only Richmond had more residents who opposed expansion than supported it. However, do not just take my word for it. Take HACAN's, who have also acknowledged that local support for expansion is greater than the opposition.

There are the facts. This is not the first time when the few who object have shouted louder than the many who quietly say 'yes'. Anti-Heathrow-expansion campaigners, however valid their views, have often framed this debate as big business versus little people. However, Heathrow is all about people: 114,000 employees, 250,000 people in the local area who rely on the airport economy, 72 million passengers each and every year, of which the most frequent flyers come from the local areas represented by the very politicians who are speaking against Heathrow expansion today.

Mr Chairman, it is right to say that the futures of local families and communities depend on Heathrow. In the past the majority of locals who support growth have been silent. Those who oppose, however well intentioned and however valid their views – and of course they have valid views – have had the field to themselves for too long, and the myth has been allowed to grow that most local people do not back expansion. Enough is enough. Thousands of local people want a bright future for their families. Thousands of local people want a bright future for their communities, and thousands of local people are saying 'yes' to the golden opportunity that a growing and successful Heathrow would bring to West London and to the UK. Mr Chairman and commissioners, whatever you choose to do, please remember this: the majority of local people in the boroughs around Heathrow do support growth at Heathrow, and please give our supporters a secure future, and please back Heathrow. Thank you.

**Christine Taylor**  
**Stop Heathrow Expansion**

Thank you. I probably should clarify: I am not on a huge salary; I am not funded by the airport to the tune of hundreds of thousands of pounds, so I cannot afford big surveys that go out to long distant places.

**Audience Member**

It is not supported by [inaudible] but it's my money.

**Christine Taylor**

Is it your money? It is also our money, and half the borough would go and a lot of people would be affected. I know you are only interested in your job. That is fine. I should probably clarify a couple of things that were mentioned. 'The stakes could not be higher.' I take it Back Heathrow are telling us we have the option of a closure of Heathrow, which seems to be what they were looking[?] for. Yes, there are people who want it. The chief executive forgot to mention 750 people who will lose their homes. The figure that they are talking about buying up is 3,750. That is homes, not people, and that is homeowners. That does not include the people who are landlords, tenants – council tenants, housing association tenants. There are thousands of people who stand to lose everything, and if you people, the Back Heathrow bloc, think that is funny, it is not. Come and live it. A heckler here said he was local; he said he lives in Ealing. To be local, all you have to do is rent a bed in a shed. We have people and families. I worked on the census as a coordinator for the south of the borough. I met one family from Italy, a couple with a baby and another one on the way, living in a shed. Two doors from me, I have a family living in a garage with no windows. That is the reality, and that is what we face, because there is nowhere to go. The chief executive also talked about all the houses that were being built. Let me just point out that Hillingdon borough have a target of 425 new-builds a new year. That is their plan for the years ahead. When I asked their planning officer what they planned to do with all of us, there was no plan. There is no plan B. If you lot really do want the airport, put your hand in your pocket and start paying for new homes for all these thousands of people who will not have a home. Pass the pot round now, because we are sick of hearing it.

Jock Lowe talked about no significant communities being impacted by noise. I presume that we are insignificant. Thank you very much, Mr Lowe. Fiona Mactaggart seemed to be concentrating on new people who will be affected by noise. I think she should realise we are not talking about history here; we are talking about daily lives. Many of the people here face day-to-day decisions based on the fact they might not have a house. You can laugh, Mr Ealing, Back Heathrow. It is not funny. Okay? It is not funny.

**Audience Member**

He does not have a brain, darling.

## Christine Taylor

No. As for Populus polls, I would like to clarify something else, because I have been on the receiving end of a phone call from Populus about one of your polls. I know what I think about the runway, and I could not answer, because the questions you ask are too loaded. All you are asking people is if they are capable of writing on a piece of paper. 'Do you have the intelligence to put a piece of paper in a pre-paid envelope, paid for by the airport? That is all we are asking.' I do not want to get into a game of Top Trumps with Rob Gray about all his friends in Isleworth and blah-blah-blah. We have people who have lived in the villages for seven generations, before there were even tents where Heathrow is, so do not talk to me about that.

Now I will get on to my speech. I am going to try my level best to contain my anger and my shaking hands in fury and keep to my script, because I know I have limited time. I have eight minutes for the thousands of people who will lose their homes. That is a heavy commitment.

I have a quote from a publication from 24 March 1999, which I will briefly go through because other people have mentioned, immediately following the end of the T5 inquiry: 'An additional runway should be ruled out forever.' Forever. That is the airport saying that. They were prepared to say that, and they will say anything to get what they want. This was before the decision had been made. However, they kept on saying it. It says, 'Our position could not be clearer, nor could it be made more formally. T5 will not lead to a third runway.' We know about the line. We have asked about the mitigation measures. Why are you not doing them now? What have you not done them? There were all the promises we had about car parking. They wanted 46,000 parking spaces. They got 42,000. It still not enough. They are still asking for more. We have had Jock Lowe talking about concreting over Iver with what he called a huge car park. Iver becomes a car park. This was the chief executive at the time, and I cannot tell you how many chief executives I have seen come and go. In fact, I met Colin Matthews for the first time as he left, and I have actually met the current chief executive more times that I met the others put together. He made promises. Some of the promises you have just seen. He got permission for Terminal 5 in November 2001. They started pouring the concrete in September 2002, and before it was dry they wanted a third runway. That is what those promises meant. No TRAG, the previous organisation, was formed in Oct 2002, and I have been actively fighting since then, most of it with no income whatsoever.

We are not NIMBYs. The airport is already in our backyard. We know what it is like to live with its noise and pollution and its continual demands for more. The driving force is greed and a hunger for profit. It is now owned by foreign investors from Spain, Qatar, Canada, Singapore and China. These investors knew its location, surrounded by homes and greenbelt. We would be fools to think that they have any interest in our wellbeing, jobs, heritage or, frankly, anything that does not benefit them financially. They employ staff to make money from their labour. If they find a machine or cheaper labour to do those jobs, they will cut jobs. Compared with the rest of Hillingdon borough, Heathrow Villages has the highest number of workers in the elementary occupations. That is, 20% compared with 11% in the rest of the borough. It also has the lowest number of workers in the professional sector. Where is the wealth for us? I have heard Fiona Mactaggart talk about Slough. She is not happy either with the way that these jobs are distributed. We have no libraries on our wards. Four out of five villages have no GP surgery. We have a tiny public swimming pool; that is about the sum of our facilities, and that is run as a charity by residents like me. We have no public meeting halls. Hillingdon money is going to people like you. It is not going to people like us. The little we get is to fight for our homes. I am paying Band E council tax to live where I am, with people living in a windowless garage two doors away.

The airport bought up a whole load of houses in these villages when there was no prospect of a runway. There was the prospect of a general election, though. In Longford, they bought them, they sold, and now they want to buy them again and flatten the entire village. The owners believe they can convince the Davies Commission and politicians to get rid of the thousands of residents too, but we are not going.

I have had a dig at Heathrow, but Heathrow Hub is no better. Steven Costello turned up at the public meeting in Colnbrook – and perhaps he can answer this later – and told residents on 20 October that he could not tell them much about the plans as it was still at the doodle stage. Yes? There were quite a few people there. He told us it was at the doodle stage, and residents were asking whether they would be affected. He told residents trapped between roads and a four-mile runway that they were not affected. Suddenly, the website changed about extending both runways at both ends, and that the current plan is just phase 1. It appears that Colnbrook residents were short-changed at that public meeting.

Why are the basic needs of the human beings who live in this area always brushed aside? We have had enough of it. It should be a basic human right to breathe the air of your environment without the fear that it is shortening your life, and we cannot do that. Studies have shown that pollution shortens the average person's life in the UK by six months. 1 in 12 deaths in London is linked to air pollution, and it is not surprising that people in the south of Hillingdon borough live seven years less than their counterparts in the north of the borough. Noise and stress affect our cardiovascular system, and if you live in Hounslow, that is you. Commission staff have told me that there are medical advisers working with the Commission who know about the research, so I will not need to give you details, but I have the details. I suggest that they take some of Heathrow's claims with that pinch of salt that Zac mentioned. I found a discussion paper from Heathrow intended for the Commission. On noise, it reads, 'Health is another area where benefits and disbenefits need to be balanced. A high-level assessment commissioned by Heathrow shows that creating jobs and raising income levels means a new runway at Heathrow could have positive health benefits. Neither noise nor health concerns should be obstacles to further development at Heathrow.' File this under stupid studies and distorted opinion polls financed by an airport prepared to defy common sense to get what it wants. It is creating a tunnel under a runway for up to 14 lanes of traffic. It is rerouting and, I guarantee you, enlarging the A4. It is quite near the M4, so watch out people in West Drayton. It is adding 250,000 air traffic movements to our skies, and that is supposed to improve our health. I have not even mentioned the freight terminals and the extra car parking in other areas.

In Hillingdon, you will be interested to know where some of your money goes, sir. 15,000 people in Hillingdon are on the asthma register. 7,000 are on GP registers for coronary heart disease. 3,500 are registered with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and 1,500 are recorded as having heart failure. If you live in Hillingdon, you have a lot to look forward to. All these people are considered vulnerable, and they are put at further risk by noise and pollution from an expanded Heathrow. Since the proposers like to talk about money, who will pay for the increased cost of providing health care for these people? The cost of air pollution on our health is measured in billions. This afternoon we have three representatives from business groups but no-one to tell the Commission how the NHS is struggling to cope with the current pressures, many of which have been created by the airport and increasing population. Will any of the businesses that say they want their runway put their money where their mouths are and pay for the public buildings, such as schools, that will go and facilities that we will need? Or would they like to put into the compensation pot? I suggest they pay up or shut up. Businesses must stop expecting the taxpayer to subsidise business plans. Aviation must pay its share of tax. Air passengers will refuse to pay

extra charges beyond a certain level, and our Chancellor is probably telling us right now that we need to tighten our belts; his tax revenue is apparently declining.

Two days ago Heathrow issued a press release saying if a third runway goes ahead, it will offer to buy 3,750 homes, and that is not people. Originally they told us 750. The Davies Commission came up with a figure of 783 – John McDonnell has already said we have heard it all before – a figure nearer our own estimate of homes and the hell that we will be living in. We cannot be compensated for what we will lose. They will say that they will pay us generously, but their own figures demonstrate that most of us will not get enough for anything comparable within striking distance of this area. If you are an airport worker, where will you live? Can you afford to commute? Perhaps you are going to have one of the houses we do not want to live in that they are going to refurbish and put a bit of insulation in, and then you people who think you are so well off can rent it. Market rent is about £1,600. We have airport workers in Sipson I have spoken to – two earners who cannot afford to live in a home like that. We have people in the Russell Gardens area, one-bedroom houses with whole families of airport workers, who have had to move out because they cannot afford the rent. Do not think this is a project aimed at you. You will be fighting for accommodation with the rest of us. Nobody can tell us where all these people are going to go. I have already mentioned nobody is building enough houses. Young and old are supposed to go into a housing market when there is a current housing crisis. Most people do not want to go. A third runway would strip us of everything we have: our homes, our health, our communities and our support networks. Worse still, it would destroy a part of our country's heritage. It will be gone forward. Sir Howard Davies, when you ruled out Thames Estuary airport, I recall that you said you could not recommend something that would not be built. I assume that you also consider a third runway can never be built.

I have finished my speech. I hope you will consider what I have said. There are very few of us who have been allowed to speak to behalf of those poor people who have lived under threat for so many years. I think they are reaching breaking point on many levels, and the fact that they are now being potentially offered the opportunity to go is very little compensation to them. Thank you for listening, and I sincerely hope the Commission will consider this properly.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you very much. I would like to throw one or two points that have been made to the Promoters, before we hear from the public gallery. I wonder if John could clarify, because I may be not the only one in the hall who starts to be confused in relation to houses. I think the issue is how many houses would actually have to be demolished. Then there is a separate question, if I understand things correctly, about how many you are offering to buy that would then be refurbished in some way. Could you clarify just what we are talking about?

### **John Holland-Kaye**

Yes, I can. Thank you. For clarification, when we first put our revised proposal together, we designed it so that we would have as few houses for airport construction as possible. That came to 750 houses. We offered to pay 25% above the unblighted market price, plus all the costs of moving, for people who would lose their homes. When we went to consultation over the last few months, what came out very clearly was that, while that was welcomed and felt to be fair, there was a need to look after the people who had not been living close to the airport boundary but would now be, some of whom would want to move on and get on with their lives but would find it much harder from being so close to the airport. Responding to that feedback and having listened to what

people had to say, we have extended our offer. If people outside of that compulsory purchase zone would like us to, we will buy their house. That is up to 3,750 homes. We have offered to buy their houses; they will not all want to move on. Some of the people who are losing their homes may want to live in those homes that we buy, and the land will stay in the local community. All of the houses we buy we will refurbish, insulate and sell into the open market. We have a thriving housing market in West London. 70% of the houses in West London have changed hands in the last 15 years, and that gives us the opportunity to provide houses for people who want to live in the local community or want to come and work at the airport.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you. Can we then move to noise? John made the point carefully. He said he was not convinced that a three-runway Heathrow could be quieter than now, particularly because of the number of planes. This potentially gets us into complicated territory about what kind of noise measure you use, but can you deal with that particular challenge?

### **John Holland-Kaye**

Yes, I can. This was our starting point. We want to make sure that anyone who is in the flight path can get alternation. It was raised earlier as being the biggest single issue for local people: can you guarantee there will be times of day when we will not have a plane flying over us? We have designed our plan exactly for that. 95% of people will be guaranteed respite from noise 50% of the time. We have started from that position, and that is why we are proposing a full-length new runway further to the west than previous proposals. Heathrow has been getting quieter. The planes have been getting quieter. You can see the difference between the old DC-10s and the 747s that are now being phased out of the airline fleet and being replaced by new planes such as the 787 and A350. They are significantly quieter than they were. Even without expansion, the number of people impacted by noise will reduce on any measure that you use because of the quieter planes that are now coming into the fleet and changes in operating procedure so that planes are flying higher over London. With expansion, we can still have fewer people impacted by noise than today. It would be more than would be case if we only had two runways, but it will still be fewer than there are today. There are some things we can do with expansion that we would not be able to do without. For example, we will be moving the point at which planes land further down the runway. That is something we can only do in an expanded airport. We cannot do that in a two-runway airport. That will benefit all the people to the east of the airport in the existing flight paths, because planes will be flying higher over them as they come in to land. That is a benefit for all the people who are currently in the local flight path, which we can only achieve with expansion.

### **Captain Jock Lowe**

I can give John an assurance that, yes, even with 40% more aeroplanes, there will be less noise by the time the new aeroplanes are introduced and the new procedures are in. What is obvious is that if there are 40% more aeroplanes in the future, then without those aeroplanes it would not be noisier. However, if you do not expand and give more slots, there will be bigger aeroplanes, because the airlines will use the opportunity to increase the size of aeroplane and there will be much more pressure on the alternation runway changes that take place now. That is where, Sir Howard, you or your commission suggested that we have an independent noise ombudsman, which I think should be the CAA. There needs to be someone to sort all this out and force through and make conditions on the changes. If there is a third runway, and I sincerely hope it is a longer runway –

although the other runway is also excellent – we have conditions that go with it and we have to meet them. If we do not meet them, we cannot expand. That does not stop the progress that is going to be made, because this commission has opened up the whole debate on the opportunity of approach noise. It has not been dealt with by the industry, as I said before, and it should be now, and so I give whatever support I can give to your suggestion of a noise ombudsman.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you. I am going to move now to hear some comments from the floor. Given the number of people we want to get in, we are not going to take questions and throw them all back. We will try to sweep those up later in the day. If you represent a particular organisation, it would be great if you said so, but otherwise individual comments are possible. I am going to ask for the first hand, nearest to you, there. Thank you. If you could limit yourself to a minute or two, that would help us enormously.

### **[Jack Sangar?]**

My name is Jack Sangar. I am a community volunteer in Southall. I am also a resident of Southall as well. I keep hearing the word ‘community’ from many of the speakers, the MPs and Heathrow today. London’s population is going to grow by about a million by 2020. In Southall, we have one of the biggest residential projects taking place, with over 4,000 new homes, as does West Drayton on the air traffic control site. I ask the audience to consider what is more important than employment in any community. Employment is the bedrock of our society, particularly in West London. I know pollution issues were mentioned earlier and that they reduce life span, but so does unemployment. Think about all the consequences of having our youth unemployment going forward. Zac Goldsmith MP mentioned earlier high blood pressure and stress levels. I totally agree, but I go back to the key point: you will also get those in a lot more constituencies further than that from the unemployment that will be created. Heathrow is our neighbour; it is the bloodline of our community in West London and particularly Southall. For the sake of our children, let us work with our neighbour for a successful future. I urge the Airports Commission to back Heathrow as swiftly as possible so we can get this project under way and bring prosperity to the residents of West London.

### **[Dudley Wood?]**

Good afternoon to everybody. My name is Dudley Wood and I back Heathrow. One of the questions I would like to ask the audience is how many of you moved here in the last 10 years knowing full well there is an airport here? The second point is that you talk about pollution, like the MPs and everybody, but what about the M4, M25 and M40? I moved to Heathrow 48 years ago on choice, because I wanted to work at the airport. If Heathrow did close or we lost a hub, then everything would go overseas and all the bigger airlines would not want to know us, and our financial institutions in London would go to pot. Gatwick is a no go because it is a horrendous journey to get to Gatwick for any of our visitors, customers or whatever. It makes common sense to do that and have Heathrow expansion. Thank you very much.

### **Audience Member**

Sir, with great respect to you and your team, I have a question for you. I have lived in Harmondsworth for 40 years. I have lost my daughter through pollution in Hillingdon Hospital. I



asked BAA what compensation is there for a life. No answer. I asked the Prime Minister, 'How are you going to compensate my daughter's life?' No answer. Sir Howard, with great respect to you, I say here now may the Lord guide you and your team, but I am a believer that this issue is not only in Britain; it is in Europe; it is worldwide. My friends in Europe and in the world do not understand the proposals before our communities across London, across Britain. This is a distraction. We are destroying Britain, bit by bit. I saw with my own eyes people in tears when they left what was a lovely community when they lost their homes. They have lost their lives, and I ask the Lord today to guide you, Sir Howard, and John of British Airports Authorities. May He guide you in the right path of life, because I go to work when I can, and when I arrive at work they say to me, 'You are looking tired'. I said to them, 'Come and live at 37 Candover Close. You are more than welcome to live there.' Yes, I chose my house, because my first house was far too small to take a disabled daughter: disabled by pollution; disabled by a Prime Minister that would not listen.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

I am sure everybody is very sorry to hear about your personal tragedy, and thank you for making your points.

### **Audience Member**

Hello. I am angry really at the rather partial use of the data sets that are being cited by the proposers of these expansions. We have heard about the green ribbon that is going to be created if Heathrow Airport's scheme goes ahead. That green ribbon is there at the moment. It is greenbelt land. It is open. People can use it. It is not new land. It is not going to be new open space. In fact, you are taking away open space, and so I think you are just being very disingenuous in this sort of thing.

The other point I would make is about the heritage of the spaces around the airport. There are lots of designated heritage assets. There are conservation areas in both Longford and Harmondsworth that will be effectively destroyed by these proposals. There are other conservation areas in Colnbrook as well. I know Harmondsworth in more detail than others. You have direct occupation from at least 600 AD. You have over a millennium and a half of life there. It has been a community, and this is being torn up for the short-term benefit of investors. There are other options. You have this deep history and it is being torn up and thrown away for a very short-term gain. I cannot believe that this airport will go on operating for more than a few dozen decades maybe. What is that compared with the centuries? You are throwing away history. You cannot get it back once you have destroyed it. You should be a little more honest in figures that you give. You are talking of two listed buildings. Well, there are 21. Words fail me, but I think we are being fed a lot of disinformation or at best very partial information both on the natural and historic environments, and I hope these points will be given full weight by the Commission. Thank you.

### **[Danny Nelson West?]**

Sir Howard and the rest of the Commission, thank you. I live in Hillingdon, just off the extended centre line of [inaudible], so I do get noise and pollution – not as much, I admit, as with Heathrow. I have lived there now with my wife and children since 1999. I have also previously lived in other parts of London: Ealing, Brentford, Kingston, Twickenham, Richmond – where the frequent flyers are – and Binfield at Junction 8/9 on the M4, all within the London boroughs and Heathrow's area of operation. I am no stranger to aircraft taking off and landing over my house.

Heathrow is very important to me and has provided work for me and my family. I worked there directly as a chef in Terminal 5, six months before and after it opened. I have also worked as a courier based in Colnbrook, but my main work for the past 30 years has been as a house manager, chef, pilot and chauffeur for private families. This involved me not only cooking, flying and managing their houses and estates for them but driving them and their children and friends to and from Heathrow. My wife has been working there now for two and a half years. That was her first job back after our first child was born in 2004. Before that she worked in – you guessed it – the Marriott and the Renaissance hotels at Heathrow. My cousin has even worked here in the Park Inn Hotel. My nephew, his cousins and friends all depend for work on parts of the M25 connected to Heathrow and other parts, as well as working on two terminals, T2 and T5. All of their friends get to work. In return, they spend a lot of cash in the local area and B&Bs and pubs, hotels and pubs, shops and pubs, restaurants and pubs, and local businesses, including pubs. If Heathrow grows and expands, so will the local economy, and everyone will benefit. The whole of my family took part in the passenger trials for T5 and T2. We readily go on family days out to the airport, including when Concorde finished off here, as well as going to Back Heathrow meetings and fun days, when they are not cancelled by the council.

My family and I are proudly of the 50,000 others within this community that have solidly supported Back Heathrow. We do so because we understand how vital the airport is to our local community and are incredible proud of it. Therefore, I wholeheartedly support expansion of Heathrow because it will not only increase jobs at the airport but increase jobs and growth in the local and wider area as well. I am really frightened that if Heathrow does not expand, all the major airlines and businesses etc. that want to expand will relocate elsewhere. What a shame it would be if all that money and those jobs, including those of my friends and family, that this would generate were to go abroad. Heathrow must keep up with the demand for air travel. Everyone wants to fly off on holiday, but nobody wants the airports in their backyard.

I knew Heathrow would be in my backyard, so I am an IMBY – an IMBYolic – and I am proud of it. I am proud. Please remember that we need Heathrow. Thank you.

### **Audience Member**

Thank you very much for asking me to speak about this issue. I have been a postmaster for the last 15 years, and we live under the path of Heathrow Airport, where I can see six aircraft coming straight for my head. I have about 1,000 footfalls per week talking to the people through the Post Office network. Since I came to know about the Heathrow issues, I talk to at least 300 people per week who come to me for passports, travel insurance or foreign currency and ask them what they think about aviation and Heathrow. I assure you that in 15 years I have had no health issues at all. I am nearly 70. My wife has no health issues; my staff have no health issues. Out of the approximately 300 people I speak to every week, more than 90% support this. Only a few people say there are health issues. However, ask these people who mention health issues what the percentage is of health issues for the total community. I support Heathrow. It is essential for the economy and development, and if it goes or it declines, you are talking about 30-40,000 people without a job. What about the 200,000 people who will lose their job? Where will they go? Thank you very much.

### **Audience Member**

I am a Richmond resident, and I would like to know where these figures of frequent flyers come from. I lived there a long time. We fly several times a year. I cannot remember the last time I flew

from Heathrow. A) I cannot afford it, and B) most of the places I want to go are much cheaper via our terrible friends Ryanair and easyJet. I would like to know: are these frequent flyers all flying from Heathrow? What are your figures based on?

**Sir Howard Davies**

I am not going to get lots of responses on this. I think you have made your point.

**Audience Member**

I would like to make one other point. UK plc has had to diversify over the last years. We cannot put all our eggs in one basket, because we will not survive. That is exactly what we are doing at Heathrow. We see this golden egg and we keep on trying to suck more gold out of it. UK plc will not survive by just going down a one-way route.

**Audience Member**

Thank you. We have just commemorated the centenary of the start of the First World War, and no-one has been left unmoved by the 888,246 poppies in the moat at Tower Hill. It is so very easy to remember the dead. It is not so easy to remember the living. My 93-year-old husband, a Royal Air Force veteran of World War 2, is sitting in a home utterly distressed at the destruction of his home, his life, his memories, his family, his friends, and the beautiful village of Harmondsworth he fell in love with so long ago.

These medals were awarded to him for putting his life on the line daily for the freedom of this country, your country, all of you, not for four greedy men and six rapacious foreign countries to destroy it all in the name of profit. Please remember those who gave you this freedom. My husband is one of them, and all of them are a dying generation. You are talking about profit when people are dying for the freedom of this country. My husband had French and British nationality, and he became British to be able to fly and spent five years in the air for every single one of you, and me. His father was in the First World War in the 11<sup>th</sup> Hussars flying the flag to help the French and the British for all your families. Please remember that profit before people is not acceptable, and we will not let you get on with it.

**Audience Member**

Thank you, Sir Howard. I want to speak as a member of the Berkshire and Surrey community. We have not yet been represented by anybody on the panel. I have not heard anyone represent us at all so far. I wanted to mention something about noise respite. I think that is very important. It is obviously very convenient for Heathrow to have what they call noise respite, which is obviously a cover for more flight paths in more different directions, 360 degrees around the airport, which would suit them perfectly, of course. Although I am not going to get a popular reception on this, I fully sympathise with people who are currently living under flight paths, with the greatest of respect to them. However, unless somebody is over the age of 90, unfortunately you did choose to live underneath existing flight paths. The recent trials over Surrey and Berkshire have shown anger and resentment from people previously unaffected by aircraft noise. People far greater than the current noise contour map are very badly affected by your continuing trials, which are carrying on despite your denials of that case. Your noise contours need to be widened significantly, by 10 or 15 miles outside Heathrow – none of this noise contour level of 57 dB. That is totally inadequate.

On compensation, we have had a local estate agent come to our house. I heard earlier that 320,000 houses will be affected by new flight paths over areas that are not currently impacted. They said 10% of our houses' value will be lost. On that conservative number of 320,000, that will be a £16 billion loss to us. Are you going to compensate us for that? Is that in these figures for the Airports Commission consultation? I do not think so. That does not include anything for the loss of amenity. That is just on our house prices. Thanks very much.

On business expansion, when a business expands beyond its premises, it relocates. What a prospect for Heathrow to do the same and the land be reutilised for housing in this residential and light commercial area. There were 106,000 noise complaints during the recent trials to Heathrow saying just how unhappy the people are in our communities.

Finally, apparently 50,000 are part of Back Heathrow. How many negative responses have they had when they have put out their propaganda stuff? People are staying silent. We are not silent. We are telling you right now we are hundreds of thousands of people all around outside your little map there telling you we are totally dissatisfied with what is going on. Thank you.

### **Audience Member**

In Heathrow's *The Promise of Heathrow* they say there is not a choice between more flights and less noise, and Heathrow will see noise reductions continue. According to them, there will be a reduction of between 15% and 21% fewer people affected by noise, and this is using the 57 dB contour. The number of people would drop by nearly 200,000. To substantiate this, Heathrow Airport used a study made for the CAA in 2012 by DP Rhodes. I have read that report, and it did not show that level of noise reduction, if any of at all. There were certain comparisons where there was a lowering of noise levels and some that increased the noise levels. The measurements were taken for both take-offs and landings. Heathrow's report on this fails to acknowledge the increase in disturbance from night-time flights between 23.00 and 06.00. It is these flights that cause the major problems for residents. As there are only 16 flights and they are all landings during these hours, there will be an average of 30 minutes between each flight. This delay between flights is enough to ensure that Heathrow's target of not exceeding the 57 dB average level is not breached. However, being woken up by noise even 30 to 45 minutes during the night results in severe lack of sleep for local residents. It should also be noted that the methods Heathrow are looking to put into place with quieter aircraft only apply to take-off. There is no noise reduction for landings, and these are the ones that affect us at night.

Finally, the UK National Health Service and the World Health Organisation recognise that broken sleep on a regular basis is life-shortening, causing diabetes, heart disease, obesity and high blood pressure. The records in the London Borough of Hillingdon show that the average life expectancy in the south of the borough is seven years less than that of the north. I would like Back Heathrow to think about that and come to conclusions as to what is causing early death in the south of this borough. Thank you.

### **Peter Willan, Richmond Heathrow Campaign**

I have two brief statements. On the respite, for those people living within five miles of Heathrow landings, the respite will drop from eight hours to four hours, and many others' respite will reduce. It is not going to increase from what I can see.

Secondly, for those who are concerned about expansion of Heathrow, it is pretty well accepted by everyone that Heathrow's passenger numbers – at roughly 72 million a year at the moment – will increase over the next 10, 15 or 20 years up to 90 million or perhaps even 100 million. Heathrow will expand by that amount without a single new runway. That is a huge increase. It is a 30-40% increase without a third runway.

Thirdly, Sir Howard, from your figures, if you add another runway to Heathrow, it will reduce the number of flights in the UK. It will also take 20% of flights from the regions back into London. On both accounts, I cannot see, in terms of the number of flights, why we need another runway at Heathrow. It will reduce all the key economic passengers. It will reduce UK business passengers, foreign business passengers and foreign leisure travellers. On all accounts, there is a reduction in business and economic value from passengers, and we are taking 20% of flights from the regions. These are tables 5.14 and 6.40 if you want to look it up in your analysis. Thank you.

**[Malcolm Whitlock?]**

My name is Malcolm Whitlock. I am a resident from Harmondsworth village. My question to the Commission has not been mentioned so far today: with an additional 250,000 flights a year, there would be a very real prospect of a catastrophic accident over densely populated London, as we nearly saw at Hatton Cross when it just managed to get over the fence. If this had happened on Hounslow, would that be classed as collateral damage? There would be more than a few thousand dead, I would suspect. That is my question.

**Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you. We are going to wind up for lunch now, because we have eaten, so to speak, into lunch. We have only 35 minutes, which I think might be just about enough. We will start promptly again at 13.15. There will be another opportunity in the afternoon session for more public statements. Thank you for all your contributions.

[Break]

**Sir Howard Davies**

We now have a session where we have witness statements from local authority leaders. We will then have the responses from the promoters to some of the challenges from there. We then have a short break. We then have business, and then we have another public session, and then I will close proceedings. We have a stellar line-up of the crème de la crème of the local authority world. We have Ray Puddifoot from Hillingdon, Steve Curran from Hounslow, Nick True from Richmond, Robert Watts from Spelthorne, Ravi Govindia from Wandsworth, Carwyn Cox from Windsor and Maidenhead, and Julian Bell from Ealing. We have an absolutely full turnout, which we are delighted about. We are very grateful to them all for sparing the time. I think Ray is going to do a tiny bit of positioning but then they are all going to keep rigorously to time thereafter. Thank you.

## **Local Authority Leaders' Statements**

**Cllr Ray Puddifoot**

**London Borough of Hillingdon**

### **I. Introductory Remarks**

Thank you, Sir Howard. Expansion at Heathrow was ruled out by the current Government on a 'no ifs or buts' basis in 2010 after considering the merits and demerits of the evidence. I am very disappointed that we are down to only three shortlisted options for the future of UK aviation and two of these are at Heathrow. Nothing has changed since 2010 to now make this a suitable location for expansion. Both Heathrow options will still require the demolition of communities, compromise health-based levels of air quality and cause widespread adverse impacts of aircraft noise pollution across more people than all the other European hub airports put together.

I cautiously welcome the approach of the Airports Commission and the wealth of information published alongside this consultation is a testament to how much work they have undertaken. However, I still have serious concerns about the impacts on people, how these aspects have been assessed, and how they will influence the final decision. I acknowledge there are economic benefits and jobs to be taken into account, but expansion would also give rise to additional pressures for more housing and employment land, which in turn requires additional supporting infrastructure, such as schools, health facilities and recreational facilities. It will be a challenge to find a suitable area to accommodate this growth.

There must be a better location for airport expansion than Heathrow. Heathrow is a thriving, internationally respected hub airport. It is close to London. It will always have a market to serve. We should be looking for the best recommendation for the UK and also remember that this should include the best recommendation for the substantial number of communities that co-exist next to the airport.

Most of the issues of concern for me are also of concern to the leaders with me here today. In order to make the best use of the Commission's time, we have therefore agreed to each concentrate on different issues rather than repeat them. Where there are differences between us, we will highlight them. I will therefore be focusing on matters relating to air quality, health, loss of communities and local road networks. Some of my comments apply to both promoters' schemes while others are more relevant to just the north-west option. Again, I will make this clear as this occurs.

### **II. Air Quality**

I am satisfied from the work presented so far from the Commission that they realise the seriousness of the issue of air quality. The high-level assessment presented in the consultation recognises the risk of significant adverse effects from failing to meet health-based EU limits. While it is unfortunate that more detailed air quality work could not be provided within this consultation, I would rather have the delay that is occurring to ensure that it is done properly. My first question is for the Commission:

- Can you confirm whether this further detailed air quality assessment will be subject to independent scrutiny, including all the assumptions used in the work, and whether there will be a full public consultation before it is used in making any final recommendation on airport expansion?

There must be absolute confidence that the health limits can be met and therefore maintained. If the promoters' assumptions, such as cleaner aircraft, cleaner road vehicles and no more airport-related traffic on the roads, do not materialise in reality it will be the local communities who will suffer the impacts. There could also be a negative impact if the runway were built but then not legally be allowed to be used. The same applies in relation to carbon issues, where offset reductions from other industries will be needed to allow aviation to expand. If these reductions do not occur in reality, this could become a constraint to the operation of the airport. My question for the promoters is:

- If your assumptions to solve air pollution issues do not occur in reality, you will find your new airport infrastructure is heavily constrained in terms of use. Have you assessed the economic impacts in the event that the expanded airport can only be partially used?

### **III. Health Impacts**

I have asked all along for a clear focus on health. There seems to be the assumption that the existing health baseline is acceptable and that existing mitigating measures such as noise insulation are both adequate and effective. This is far from the truth. Heathrow will remain an internationally respected, successful airport without any further runways. The surrounding communities will still have the advantages of the jobs that it creates. However, as an example, using the way that the EU measures the extent of noise, which is the Lden metric, by 2030 nearly 186,000 people could experience less noise than they do today if the predicted less noisy aircraft technologies occur in reality. However, Heathrow expansion in both options would take all the potential advantage away. In 2030, with expansion, with the north-west option 580,000 will be affected; with the extended runway nearly 900,000 will be affected; and with Gatwick 22,000 will be affected.

I am not convinced that the quality of life appraisal approach adequately covers the aspect of health. It is disappointing that the word 'health' is only mentioned once in the 94 pages of the Airports Commission's consultation report. I would therefore be concerned if this assessment was used to inform any policy on the best location of this airport. I give one small example. I quote from the quality of life assessment. 'Any effect on children is omitted, since our analysis is based on data only for adults, which means that we do not know the impact on children. If children are like adults, this means that we will underestimate the cost associated with airport noise on local communities. Linked to this is the possible long-term effect on children's educational attainment.'

My questions to the Commission and the promoters are these:

- Do you agree that the impact of your expansion proposals on the health of the surrounding communities should be properly identified now in order to form part of the decision-making process to select the best option?
- Do you agree that the provision of proper health impact assessments should form an integral part of this process and that it will be too late to do this work once the recommendation has been narrowed down to one option?

## **IV. Community Loss**

### **1. Housing**

The north-west option at Heathrow represents demolition of the highest number of houses and community facilities of all the options. All of these occur in my borough. It results in a total loss of Longford, most of which is a conservation area. Two other villages are cut in half. What remains of Harmondsworth will be hemmed in by a three-metre airport boundary wall and a potentially re-routed busy A-road. The other village, Sipson, will lie between a five-metre airport boundary wall and the airport spur road. The document refers to 783 properties being demolished, but I suspect this would be higher. An extra 289 homes have already been mentioned in relation to potential demolition for service access. Given the unliveable conditions that others will be faced with, the figures could be much higher. I note that the Commission acknowledge there will be no community cohesion left. I am not sure that the 25% uplift on property prices that is being offered will be sufficient for people to buy comparable homes within neighbouring areas. It is only just about possible in our borough to cope with the increase in our population at both ends – children and adults – and to find homes for them.

My questions to the promoter are:

- Where does the promoter consider that the local community would be re-housed?
- Where are the additional workers required for the extended airport to be housed, or are the jobs not to be seen as local jobs and to be occupied by those who commute in?

### **2. Green Space**

The Heathrow option takes nearly 700 hectares of green belt. It presents a major flood risk, even with mitigation. It will require the relocation of a major energy-from-waste facility. It destroys heritage assets, takes away valued open space to replace it with over-flown open space, and removes the green lung buffer between the current airport and more densely populated areas of my borough. It has a devastating impact on the southern Colne Valley at a time when the north of the Colne Valley is already being compromised by the construction and operation of High Speed 2. The extended northern runway option has similar impacts, including loss of 580 hectares of designated green belt, loss of agricultural land, and the loss of an existing industrial estate, new flight paths over tranquil areas and the loss of heritage sites. My question is:

- Has the full cumulative effect of the impact on the west of London been properly accounted for?

## **V. Local Roads**

### **1. Airport-Related Traffic**

Both schemes' promoters present the assumption that expansion can be delivered with no overall increase in airport-related traffic on the roads than there is today. It is hard to believe, but that is the claim. If the measures behind this assumption do not occur in reality, this will simply lead to more traffic on the roads and raise issues over congestion and adverse impacts on air quality. The Commission suggests that there may be a need to widen the M4. This will have impacts on



communities in my borough who live close to the M4. The Commission's documents forecast high levels of congestion on roads such as the M25, the M4 and the M40. This is at the same time as the airport operator is aspiring to deliver a doubling of freight capacity. The Commission recognises that there could be growing road congestion challenges with this aspiration, yet despite these risks there is no freight impact assessment provided and there is no detailed traffic modelling on local roads available for us to assess the impacts. By not assessing the impacts of the increase in freight vehicles, we could seriously underestimate the future pollution levels. My questions are:

- Why have these important details not already been provided?
- Do you believe that any final recommendation can be made without an assessment of the potential impacts on local communities being carried out and made available for public consultation?

## **2. Congestion Charge**

If all the measures fail, the promoters have suggested the addition of a congestion charge. I am unclear whether that congestion charge will work for people accessing the airport. In my view, all of this needs to be properly assessed and costed before any final recommendation is made. My questions are:

- How will a congestion charge for the airport work in practice?
- What level does a congestion charge need to be set at to ensure a reduction in traffic to the airport?
- What are the impacts of such a charge on local communities?
- Where will the money go?

## **VI. Concluding Remarks**

We in Hillingdon have said from day one that we are the elected representatives of the community and we will oppose any expansion at Heathrow, and that will continue. This will not happen. It would not be accepted anywhere else in Europe, and it is simply not acceptable in the United Kingdom. Thank you.

[Applause and heckling]

**Cllr Steve Curran**  
**London Borough of Hounslow**

## **I. Preamble**

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to present the council's initial views on the airport expansion proposals presented within your consultation document. As you know, the council takes

the view that Heathrow should be better, not bigger. We disagree with the proposals to expand Heathrow because of the noise and the pollution it causes and the effect it has on our community. We do, however, recognise the significant benefits the airport brings in terms of the local economy and employment.

Where we particularly disagree with the airport is on the level of mitigation offered for the current and future situations. For example, we believe that the insulation and ventilation schemes provided should be available to many more local people and be funded so that the communities do not bear their costs. We are also concerned about the airport related to congestion on our roads and the associated levels of air pollution this causes, and we want improvement to public transport to further mitigate these problems.

## **II. Noise Mitigation**

The council believes that the benefits of being close to Heathrow need to be greater and more tangible for the whole of our community. The council wants Heathrow to be a better neighbour and to be more responsive to residents' views. The mitigation and compensation package offered by the airport should be second to none and based on need. The current mitigation package is not good enough, particularly in relation to schools.

The council accepts that there is a huge potential economic benefit from Heathrow's expansion. If the Commission is minded to recommend a Heathrow option, the noise mitigation package should be commensurate with the benefits experienced by Heathrow shareholders and the country as a whole. The current offer included in Heathrow's north-west proposal is admittedly an improvement on the existing scheme, but, as the Commission's own work on noise has demonstrated, this falls below the standards seen in other major European airports.

The council has commissioned a study that examines the cost of providing insulation and double glazing in every affected house in Hounslow. The report states that the total cost, based on the average figure of £2,500 per house, would be £207 million. This would take up a significant proportion of the money that Heathrow have set aside in their current proposals. From this, we conclude that a more generous offer is needed.

## **III. Effect of Noise on Schools**

The council believes that no child should suffer any educational deficit due to the fact they are taught in a school that is affected by aircraft noise. The council is frustrated that the mitigation currently on offer from Heathrow is often the minimum. The council currently faces a serious financial shortfall in meeting the Department for Education standards in relation to acoustic insulation. Appropriate noise insulation and ventilation must be provided for any premises where education is undertaken. This must be the case if Heathrow expands or continues as it is.

Heathrow Airport [does not?] operate a noise insulation scheme that includes school buildings. Heathrow take the view that their scheme goes beyond what is required by the Government's transport policy issued by the Department for Transport in terms of what is offered. The problem Hounslow faces is that the policy governing the internal acoustic conditions within school classrooms is based on different noise criteria to that which defines a noise insulation scheme boundary. This results in some of Hounslow's noise-affected schools not being included in the Heathrow scheme. When Heathrow came to retrofit and built new classrooms in these schools, it cost more money to do the extra noise insulation that had to be installed. This funding gap has to

be met by the borough. The council believe this is unfair and unsustainable. I await Heathrow's forthcoming announcement on this matter with interest.

#### **IV. Local Economy**

I want to say one or two words about the local economy that Heathrow provides. As much as 20% of the borough's employment depends upon the airport and its supply chain. A recent economic study commissioned by the council shows that this figure rises to 30% [inaudible] once employment is factored in. It is without doubt that the council has absolutely no desire to see the closure of Heathrow or a significant reduction in its volumes of air traffic. The council would like to see Heathrow make further contributions to its upskilling of the local workforce and would welcome the creation of a new aviation skills academy in the borough. This would ensure that our residents have the opportunity to become the engineers, air traffic controllers and pilots of the future.

It is recognised that a third runway would lead to an increase in employment within the wider Heathrow area. This will attract more people to live in the area and result in further pressure on local services – by which I mean schools, doctors' surgeries and other healthcare facilities. There is also the issue of housing provision. We work very hard in Hounslow to provide decent and affordable homes for people to live in. Expanding Heathrow would increase the demand and make this a more difficult task. Aspects of Heathrow's expansion such as these must be considered in the mitigation.

#### **V. Transport**

Congestion on our local road and rail networks generated by the presence of Heathrow is a significant issue for us. It gives rise to poor air quality, affects our community and interferes with other business activity. High air pollution levels could ultimately attract a fine from the European Union, which may have to be partly met by local authorities such as ours. The council welcomes the Commission's recognition of the tensions between airport users and other uses of the local transport network, but has not seen any concrete plans that will manage this tension. It could be argued that an extension of the free public transport zone could offset some of the transport problems local people experience. Perhaps this could be considered.

Heathrow needs to be a public transport hub, which should include:

- Frequent, 24-hour bus services so that people can get to work.
- The incorporation of Heathrow Express within the TfL fare structure.
- Upgrade of the Piccadilly Line.
- The immediate implementation of a kiss-and-fly charge, with revenues going to local transport improvements.

Equally, surface access to Heathrow needs to address the air quality issue from a strategic perspective. The aviation component of air pollution concentrated within the Heathrow area needs to be defined and agreed once and for all.

## **VI. Night Flights**

Before I conclude, I would like to say a word on night flights. Night noise from aircraft is the biggest cause of community disturbance and annoyance from Heathrow. It is the position of the London Borough of Hounslow that a night curfew should be instigated between the hours of 23.00 and 07.00, emergencies excepted. The promoters of the Heathrow Hub scheme have indicated to us that that may be something they could introduce. The council is interested to hear more on this aspect of their proposal.

## **VII. Concluding Remarks**

We value our relationship with Heathrow, particularly the employment it brings and the value it adds to our economy. We believe that this relationship has improved and will continue to improve as we gain a better understanding of each other's points of view. We hope to build on our discussions and we will continue to talk with Heathrow, seeking improvements that will benefit the local community both now and in the future. You will not be surprised to know that I am very pleased to hear Heathrow's recent public commitment to the completion of the schools insulation programme by the summer of 2015. As we have heard today already, airport expansion brings a whole new set of challenges, and while we maintain our policy of 'better, not bigger', we believe that it is necessary to take an active part in the debate. Should the Commission decide that Heathrow is to expand and this is accepted by the Government of the day, we need to be confident that local needs are properly taken into consideration. Our views will be shaped by the Commission's work and by our ongoing dialogue with scheme promoters. We hope that all concerned see the benefits of us continuing to discuss these issues in a fair and open way.

## **VIII. Questions**

I would just like to add some questions, Chair:

- How did Heathrow determine the figure of £550 million for the compensation package?
- We feel it is unclear what compensation is available for residents and what is available for our community buildings such as schools in terms of insulation and ventilation. Could this be clarified?
- Will Heathrow commit to working with Hounslow to achieve Department for Education acoustic standards in our schools?
- Will Heathrow fund the greater need for public services as identified by the Commission in their business case and sustainability assessment, taking on their proposals if runway three proceeds?
- Regarding the economy, the Commission has identified in their assessment that the jobs created by the expansion of Heathrow would help reduce unemployment rates in boroughs, such as Hounslow, which neighbour the airport. Many of the jobs created will be relatively low-skilled. Will the scheme promoters explain what plans they would have to offer workers in Hounslow high-quality, high-skilled job opportunities so that they can further their own aspirations?

- What plans do Heathrow have to manage disruption to the local and strategic road network should runway three proceed?

Thank you.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you very much. We are going to move on to Nick True. You should be aware, Nick, since you were not here, that there were those who accused you of being the Leader of the London Borough of Frequent Fliers, not a [inaudible] I would wish to repeat in any way. You were defended by some of your residents, but I should just warn you that if you mention that there will be a bit of resonance in the hall. Over to you.

## **Cllr Nicholas True**

### **London Borough of Richmond**

#### **I. Preamble**

Thank you. Well, I declare an interest: I am a member of no frequent-flier scheme. By the way, I think that it is perfectly reasonable for people who lead normal lives, which I think people who promote flights consider include flying, to have a view about where flights should take place. I think those who own and make profit should not make those kinds of disparaging remarks.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

That was not from the airports, I should emphasise.

[Heckling]

### **Cllr Nicholas True**

There is a general point. Those who sit on this platform, whatever views we express, do have a democratic mandate to express those views, and we will unhesitatingly do so. I agree with the comments made by my colleagues. I actually thought it was deplorable that the Back Heathrow campaign attempted to interfere in the local election in Hillingdon and campaigned against a borough leader for taking a position that his local public supported.

[Heckling]

If I am allowed to be heard, we as local authorities publish every item of spending over £500 that we commit. We are subject to freedom of information. Perhaps the Back Heathrow campaign would like to lay on the table today full details of the funding behind their campaign.

[Applause]

While we are on the question of interfering in elections, I do not seek to interfere in the elections in Qatar or China, and I would be grateful if people did not interfere in ours.

As far as the local mandate is concerned, not only are we democratically elected but the London Borough of Richmond and the London Borough of Hillingdon funded a referendum which 150,000 real people – not opinion-pollster-selected people – took part in. Over 110,000 Londoners in just two boroughs said no to Heathrow expansion. I believe that was an incredibly powerful voice which should be respected. In politics you have to do things with consent, and I will always stand up for the voice of my local residents. That is not being NIMBY. I deplore the attacks on and implication that people who live in and around Heathrow are unreasonable in saying ‘no more’. We already take 40% of the noise pollution in Europe. We have done it year after year, decade after decade. Kindly do not lecture people when they say ‘no more, please’.

[Applause]

## **II. Flight Paths**

I have two or three specific points to raise. The first is on flight paths. I know that this was mentioned this morning. Communities have recently been up in arms over changes to the airspace during the recent easterly take-off trials. It has actually mobilised one whole ward in my borough as a result of what happened there. I believe that we need to see the flight paths published. I was told this morning that it is not possible. Well, let us have two or three possible scenarios, if they say they cannot have one. Will the promoters therefore publish exemplary flight paths shortly so that communities can actually understand the potential impacts on them? This has simply not yet been done and must be done.

## **III. Night Flights**

Of course I support what was said by Councillor Curran. Will the promoters explain how night flights will be eliminated to comply with Councillor Curran’s request? What would be the impact on respite? It is laudable that a promoter is trying to retain a measure of respite, but it cannot actually mask the fact that a new runway will result in there being less respite to share from the current position.

## **IV. Competition**

I want to say something about competition. We broke up a monopoly at Heathrow. Are we now to recreate a giant monopoly with three runways out of four in the London area? It seems a very odd way of doing public policy. I think in terms of cost and, indeed, resilience if there were weather problems, if we are going to have extra runway space we would benefit from competition and having that in two separate places.

## **V. Safety**

I am worried about safety. In my ward, in recent years we have had a body fall from the sky and we get ice blobs falling on our borough. I believe it actually to be irresponsible – I will not use a stronger word – particularly in this age of terrorism, to take an airport which is flying hundreds of thousands of flights above the most densely populated area in much of Europe and pile more flights over there. It is actually asking for trouble, and I do not think enough contention has been given to

the potential safety. Will the promoters please publish a scenario of what might happen if a flight came down over the flight paths that they propose in West London? I see no serious consideration of what the impact of that would be in terms of cost and of cost in human lives.

## **VI. Open Spaces**

We have a great deal of high-quality public green space in West London, and you cannot build adobes over Bushy Park or Richmond Park or any of the wide green space. I think it is a horrific idea of the future that we have to build adobes over space so that people can expand an airport in an unsuitable place. I wish that more consideration would be given to the impact on what bits of nature we have in West London. I do not think that has been suitably considered or answered in the inquiry.

## **VII. Politics and Trust**

The final thing I will say – and it comes back to where I started – is that trust is essential. I believe we have a great problem in our country about politicians saying one thing and doing another. I had doubts about the Commission being set up but I pay tribute to Sir Howard Davies and the Commission and the way they have conducted it, and I am very grateful that we are having this session here today. I think they should be thanked for that. But I am very mindful of what was said before the last election: ‘No ifs, no buts. No third runway.’

[Applause]

That was said by the leader of my party; it was supported by the leader of the Liberal Democrat party and it was accepted by the leader of the Labour party. There was nothing in there about small print – ‘oh, but that is only for four years’. The people of West London believe that is a good promise. It is a promise I stand by. It is a promise I think that our leaders should stand by. We will try to hold the political world to that promise, because we have to re-build trust in politics. We cannot ignore the political dimension. If an attempt is made to break that feeling despite all the arguments against Heathrow, there will be the mother and father of a political fight against these options and I will be proud to be associated with the hundreds and thousands of people who I know will take part in that.

[Applause]

### **Cllr Robert Watts Spelthorne Borough Council**

## **I. Support for Expansion**

### **1. Economic Benefits**

I am delighted to be able to address you today as a council leader that supports the expansion of Heathrow Airport.

[Applause]

This is a longstanding position which Spelthorne Borough Council reaffirmed as recently as 16 January 2014. About 4,000 of my residents work at the airport. That is over 8% of all those in work. Many work in support businesses such as the hugely important air freight business. The cargo terminal is the closest part of the airport to us – we previously gave up part of the airport – and in value terms is the biggest port in the UK. We have many major businesses located in the borough because of our proximity to Heathrow. For example, BP at Sunbury, which itself employs over 4,500 people and has there one of its international training facilities. In turn, these businesses make a major contribution to our economy.

In giving our support for Heathrow, we have no illusions about the huge challenges any airport expansion brings, but we are convinced that Heathrow is the right location in both the local and national economic interest. In reaffirming our support for Heathrow, we also recognise the importance and necessity of good transport links and properly addressing the environmental and other impacts that many of my fellow council leaders have talked about. I am concerned to ensure in every respect I secure the best outcome for all of my residents.

We face a stark choice: either Heathrow grows and maintains its role as a major hub airport, with all its national economic benefits, or we do nothing and by default lose that hub status. The Commission's own figures show that the HAL scheme would bring a growth of 41,000 more jobs by 2030, but if we do nothing we could lose up to 14,000 jobs by 2030. It is therefore clear that doing nothing means the decline of our local economy in Spelthorne.

## **2. Preferred Option**

In supporting Heathrow as a location, there is a question of which option we prefer. My authority has yet to come to a view on that but will formally be considering the latest consultation material. However, at this stage my view is that the HAL scheme, with a new independent runway to the north-west, provides a more flexible and therefore more resilient airport. For that reason, I personally support HAL's proposal.

## **II. Mitigation**

### **1. Overview**

As I have referred to, my council's support for Heathrow is conditional on securing the necessary associated transport improvements and mitigating all of the environmental and other impacts. This includes noise and air-quality issues as well as protecting and, where possible, enhancing the environment around the airport for those who live there. Detailed proposals for the airport will need to show how this will be achieved. The draft master plan produced by HAL is a good starter, but more will need to be done and we are keen to work with them.

### **2. Noise**

However, noise is understandably a major issue. While there has been a vast improvement in recent decades, more needs to be done so, despite growth, significant improvement continues for our residents. I welcome HAL's blueprint for noise reduction published recently and I hope this is just the start of a committed and determined approach on this issue.



### **3. Air Quality and Transport**

Air quality and transport issues are clearly linked. Much is rightly made of improved rail access and its undisputed contribution to modal shift, but in those localities like mine which are very close to the airport, improved bus links and quality cycle routes have an important role to play. It will be essential, in my view, that HAL invests in these as part of a comprehensive approach to transport, including ongoing revenue support where required. A crucial concern to me is that with the past proposals at Heathrow some of the wider opportunities for environmental and transport improvements were not fully taken on board by the Government when the final decisions were made, and I ask the Commission to look at that.

I hope you will therefore understand why I not only ask you to support HAL's Heathrow proposal but urge you to stress in your final report to Government that the effective and comprehensive mitigation of all environmental and transport issues is a pre-requisite.

### **III. Housing Demand**

Finally, on a wider issue, the proposals of this scale will have wider strategic implications – for example, for housing demand. My colleagues have spoken about housing demand. Outside London there are no longer regional planning bodies to assist in the process. I ask the Commission to begin to formulate a recommendation to Government asking it to put in place effective and essential[?] mechanisms so that these matters can be planned in the proper way. All affected local authorities will need to be involved in agreeing such arrangements for this.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you on my behalf as I am a borough supporting this expansion.

[Applause]

**Cllr Ravi Govindia**

**London Borough of Wandsworth**

### **I. Introductory Remarks**

#### **1. Competition**

Thank you, Sir Howard, for this opportunity. I am here on behalf of thousands of residents of Wandsworth who suffer severe and damaging effects as a result of aircraft noise and in particular night flights. My colleagues mentioned the issue of competition and monopoly. Residents in Wandsworth ask the question: where are the interests of the flying public taken into account in creating this mega monopoly? They fear that ultimately they will be at the mercy of the monopoly, as inevitably all monopolies do.

## 2. Noise Blueprint

We believe expansion in the form of a third runway at Heathrow or the hub model will make this situation much worse. Both expansion proposals include noise respite proposals which are beyond the airport's ability to control or deliver. I mention the blueprint for noise reduction that Heathrow have just published. It is full of 'what we would like to do' and 'what we should do' whereas many people in Wandsworth, Hounslow, Richmond and Hillingdon would say, 'You should have been doing this a long time ago. You should not be thinking about it now.'

[Applause]

Both expansion proposals also include projections on the impact of quieter planes and new landing procedures, which are also unproven and beyond the airport's control and are highly optimistic. Today, very simple respite arrangements at Heathrow can only operate 50% of the time. The new, more elaborate proposals will be harder to deliver and have yet to be tested. Our biggest concern with the Commission process is that the computer modelling used to assess noise impacts is fundamentally flawed and does not reflect the day-to-day experience of our residents. People complain about noise in their back gardens and they complain about inability to use their back gardens. That is how people perceive noise and that is how people in fact are affected by noise. These computer models claim that Heathrow has become quieter as the number of flights over London and the Home Counties has increased. This is plainly wrong. The average plane has become slightly quieter, but every single one is still sufficiently noisy to wake up residents from sleep and disturb people during the day.

The number of flights over London is at an all-time high. There is a direct relationship between the level of noise and the upset caused. On the ground, you cannot tell the difference between the new-generation planes and the last-generation planes, and the CAA have confirmed this. The only difference people are aware of is that there are more of them.

## II. Night Flights

Wandsworth and its 2M partners have long campaigned for a complete ban on the pre-06.00 flights. Night flights are by far the most disruptive and damaging element of Heathrow's operation. At a recent public meeting, a [Heathrow Hub?] representative did say that it was quite possible to have a night-time curfew on the operation of Heathrow, whereas the Heathrow representative did not make such a promise. My question to the Commission would be:

- A night-time curfew is in place in Frankfurt. Why has the Commission not investigated the option of a night curfew at Heathrow now or as a condition of a possible expansion?

The question to Heathrow is:

- As an operator, can you tell me whether you support the introduction of a complete night-flight ban as a condition of further expansion or a third runway?

### **III. Noise Assumptions**

#### **1. Overview**

It seems the Airports Commission has relied on the assumption that improvements in fleet, changes in flight paths and new landing patterns and operational procedures will lead to an ongoing reduction in the noise contour. We know that it is the number of noise events that is the most important factor in disturbance, so reduction in noise contours may not be matched by any reduction in the noise if combined with an increase in aircraft numbers. There are also proposals to change the way flights land from the current east-directional landing system. The point is there that more areas currently unaffected will be affected if curved landing is to take place. The point was made earlier that we need to tell the people where those flight paths will be, what the impact might be and whether they would be prepared to live under those additional noise conditions.

#### **2. Quieter Planes**

The CAA's own evidence to the Commission says that there is no perceptible improvement in noise between the latest aircraft types, such as the Boeing 787 and the A380, as they fly over Wandsworth. In real-world conditions, one is just as disturbing as the other. Our concern is the Commission is using computer-generated noise models which say that these new aircraft are quieter. The CAA's own evidence at Heathrow is showing that over Wandsworth there is actually little or no perceived benefit from the latest aircraft.

#### **3. Steeper Approaches**

Even if these untested techniques are proved, by the CAA's admission we are looking at a change of a couple of decibels, which is not enough to make a perceptible difference. Planes may be slightly higher; it is now less annoying, but it still wakes you up. The computer models do not reflect the reality.

### **IV. Respite**

Mention has been made of respite. One of the third-runway options for Heathrow is called the 'respite option'. It involves multiple curved arrival routes into Heathrow instead of the two relatively straight single streams of aircraft we have today. We do not believe that Heathrow or the Commission have the power to ensure that this elaborate and untested respite procedure would ever be put into action. The truth is the National Air Traffic Service control the sky. They are effectively the policemen of the sky and their primary concern is safety. If there are any concerns about wind conditions or anything else, they will ignore any respite arrangements and the planes will land along the safest and most direct routes. Today, with two runways, relatively simple respite arrangements are only adhered to half the time. If Heathrow expands to three runways, this brings a further, more complex respite system and we expect that air traffic controllers will over-rule it far more frequently. Again, at a recent public meeting a Heathrow representative was unable to assure a resident that their current respite will be preserved and protected into the future because he simply cannot guarantee that.

The questions to the promoters are:

- Is it not the case that your proposals for respite, which underpin your case, cannot actually be guaranteed and that they are not within your gift to deliver?
- Can you provide a guarantee to the residents of Wandsworth that your scheme options will continue to provide the current half day of respite that exists?

For the Commission:

- Given the poor delivery record from today's Heathrow respite plans, how can you endorse a new, more elaborate respite plan without further guarantee from CAA and NATS that they can be delivered?
- Given the reaction to the new routes over Teddington and other places, can you be confident that respite plans with so many new flight paths can actually be delivered?

The Commission talks about the need to redesign the airspace over London, one of the busiest airspaces in the world. The Commission's risk analysis says that it will require redesign of the London airspace system and, in its own words, it is a complicated process likely to take several years. We could have an expansion of Heathrow agreed before a new airspace design has been agreed by the people. The Commission needs to answer these questions:

- Given the reaction to last summer's airspace trials around Heathrow, which seem to have caught both the CAA and Heathrow by surprise, does the Commission now accept the risk of not being able to deliver the third runway in a socially acceptable manner are much higher?
- Given the pivotal nature of the airspace issue to the project, is the Commission in danger of proceeding with an option that might actually not be deliverable?

## **V. Noise Mitigation**

Today, Heathrow does less to mitigate the impact of noise on the surrounding communities, and Councillor Curran mentioned that. Compared to European rivals, what Heathrow does is pitiful. This has not been addressed in the Commission's work. Will the promoters here today commit to providing the same level of mitigation that currently is provided to residents around Paris as a part of mitigation proposals? This is to work to a 55 Lden contour. If not, can they explain why Londoners deserve a poorer deal than Parisians?

## **VI. Southern Rail Access**

Some mention has been made of the southern rail access. Can I just make this point about the southern rail access? The proposals for improved connectivity across South London are required under the current operations of Heathrow, not under the expanded operations at Heathrow. Any suggestion that the southern rail access is only dependent on an expanded Heathrow is unacceptable and wrong.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

**Cllr Carwyn Cox**  
**Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead**

## **I. Preamble**

Firstly, a confession. I am not actually the Leader of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, though I am glad to accept the temporary promotion for this afternoon. Thank you to the Commission for the opportunity to speak. As has already been said, a great deal of work has been carried out by yourselves, and it is appreciated. I would also like to thank those involved in the Royal Borough's aviation forum and the officers of the council for all of the work that they do for the residents of the Royal Borough who are affected by noise from Heathrow.

## **II. Objectives**

The Royal Borough is different to most of the speakers you have heard from today in that it is to the west of the airport. Its boundary is just one and a half miles from the end of the current northern runway. Many of its communities lie under its current flight paths and are affected by aircraft noise. Our principal objectives are:

- To preserve and protect the local environment and its quality of life for the 140,000 residents as well as 7 million visitors to the Royal Borough.
- To protect the open countryside of the borough, which I hope you will agree contains some of the most beautiful in the country.
- To advocate night-flight restrictions and noise mitigation.

Our policy is that we believe that Heathrow should be better, not bigger.

## **III. Expansion Proposals**

The proposals that you have before you would extent the airport to the west. The Heathrow Airport Limited proposal would be 1.5km to the west, meaning that aircraft would, in all probability, be some 250 feet lower, particularly when landing. The Heathrow Hub proposals would be 3km to the west, meaning that aircraft would probably be some 450 feet lower. This would significantly affect the residents living in Horton, Datchet and Eton. We will be attempting to submit a detailed response to the consultation document, so what I wish to do in the time that I have is to highlight particular areas of concern to the Royal Borough and its residents.

## **IV. Flight Paths**

As has been said by other speakers on this panel, where are they going to be? We are told that some 320,000 people will be affected. Has the impact that may be upon them been assessed? The recent trials, held without sufficient, if any, proper consultation, dramatically affected residents in Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale. These were communities that had not been flown over previously to the extent that they were in those trials. This resulted in public outcry and over 1,200 residents cramming into Ascot racecourse for a public meeting. The information as to who will be

affected and to what extent is therefore vital so that we can liaise with our residents, speak to them, understand what their views are and effectively represent our communities.

We support the idea of a study into the attitudes to noise and the impact that may be felt by residents, which would be similar to the ANASE studies that have previously been carried out. We support further research into the health effects upon residents who are affected by noise.

## **V. Housing**

The possible housing impact is unclear. No evidence of where the proposed housing that will be required has been provided. The need for housing without the future potential expansion for Heathrow is already measured in the multiple thousands. The Royal Borough is surrounded by green belt and it is the policy of this council not to build in green belt, as supported by the National Planning Policy Framework. In terms of the questions:

- Can promoters confirm whether those local authorities that neighbour or are in the vicinity of Heathrow were consulted on housing capacities?
- What mitigation has been planned if the anticipated housing requirement exceeds that potential capacity?

## **VI. Roads**

Much has been said about the potential impact on road networks. The Royal Borough has an air quality management area at junction 13 of the M25 already due to excess levels of nitrogen dioxide. That is the position now, let alone with further road transport being on the roads as a result of the realistically greater levels of traffic that will exist. We have a consultation from Government in respect of using the M4 hard shoulder in times of heavy traffic. Our road networks around the airport are already stretched to capacity. It is folly to believe that there will not be greater traffic on the roads with an expanded airport.

## **VII. Flooding**

What mitigation packages are going to be provided? The Royal Borough suffered terribly in the floods of 2014. Datchet, Old Windsor and particularly Wraysbury, as well as other areas, were blighted for days. The Royal Borough became the centre of the world's media for several days and there are still residents who are struggling to get back into their homes as a result of the damage that was caused.

- What assessment has been done on the potential effect of the schemes on the flood zones that are in the area?
- How will any mitigation packages feed into the Government's proposed flood-alleviation schemes?
- What are the costs?

## **VIII. Open Spaces and Heritage**

The Royal Borough contains its own important open spaces and areas of heritage. It goes without saying that the Royal Borough is the principal home for Her Majesty the Queen and of course has the Windsor Great Park, which is of great importance to residents who use that wonderful open space. We are told there is a mitigation master plan. We have not seen it. People move out of London in order to escape noise, to live in a more rural setting and to use open areas. The heritage of the area would be significantly blighted. In addition, schools would be affected by increased air traffic, and of course one of those schools is Eton College.

[Heckling]

It is sad, I know, but it is a historic place. We have to reply to the consultation by 3 February. We need more information and we need more time. We agree that Heathrow should be better and not bigger. Thank you.

**Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you. I will refrain from asking whether you have consulted any of Eton's old boys about [inaudible]. Councillor Julian Bell.

**Cllr Julian Bell**

**London Borough of Ealing**

### **I. Preamble**

Thank you, Sir Howard. I am very grateful to be able to speak. In terms of Ealing Council's position, historically we have always been, on balance, against Heathrow expansion. However, I would say that it has always been a very finely balanced decision, primarily because of the employment benefits to the borough.

### **II. Economic Factors**

I think it is clear that we support Heathrow as a major hub airport. It is key to the economy of West London and provides a source of employment particularly for those with lower skills. Obviously, we would like to thank you, Sir Howard, for ruling out the estuary airport option. That would have clearly had enormous impacts, with the closure of Heathrow airport, and I think that that was something that we would not countenance. Councillor Curran talked about the independent study that Hounslow, Ealing and Slough commissioned in terms of job impacts of all of the different options, but clearly it would have been catastrophic if Heathrow had closed. It is vital also that Heathrow remains as a hub airport.

Let me just give you some examples of the numbers of jobs that we have in some of the most deprived wards. In Southall, nearly 30% of the jobs are at the airport. If you go further north to Northolt, 8-9% of the jobs are at the airport. It is clearly also, I think, important to recognise that any diminution of Heathrow would lead to the loss of jobs to the UK, as many businesses would

relocate to mainland Europe from West London if Heathrow went into decline. Having said that, Ealing would be content with the Heathwick option if the point-to-point traffic went to Gatwick and Heathrow remained as the hub.

### **III. Noise**

Clearly, the other side of the debate and discussion is around noise pollution, particularly in terms of easterly take-offs over Southall, Hanwell, Ealing, Chiswick and Acton. I would reiterate what other leaders have said in terms of having to have the detail of the flight paths and the impacts on our residents. We really cannot know what the true impacts of these proposals will be without that detailed information about flight paths. Certainly – belated though it is – we welcome the proposals around the noise blueprint. I would reiterate what Councillor Curran and Councillor Govindia have said in terms of night flights and ask the same question that Councillor Govindia asked about whether or not we could have a ban on night flights like Frankfurt.

### **IV. Environmental Impact**

In terms of environmental impacts, a lot of the impacts for us as a borough are actually around surface transport – traffic and pollution from cars. Obviously, improved rail links to Heathrow and reduction in traffic access to the airport is a vital part of its development. Again, we would acknowledge that the mitigation package has improved, but again, like Councillor Curran said, it needs to be better. We welcome the proposals around jobs with the aviation skills academy, but again recognise that a lot needs to be done in that respect.

### **V. Concluding Remarks**

As I have said, we would be content to see expansion of Gatwick, but we are also, because of our easterly position, interested in the Heathrow Hub proposal, which impacts negatively on the previous speaker; it potentially impacts less negatively on us and would allow expansion in capacity without increased noise for Ealing. However, we do not support expansion of Heathrow as it is currently proposed.

Thank you very much.

## **Responses**

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you for those contributions, which raised a lot of interesting points for the promoters and some for the Commission. One or two of them were, I think, rather detailed, looking at the CAA modelling over Wandsworth, for example, which I have noted down as things that we need to give further thought to but I do not want to give an on-the-hoof response to those. Let me pick up, however, one or two.



On air quality, as I said this morning, we are carrying out further work on dispersal modelling looking at individual sites. That will be done independently and in addition to a consultancy working for us on them we have members of our advisory panel who are independent academic experts on noise who will be giving that work independent expert scrutiny. I hope we will be able to fill in that gap.

On flight paths, a point that Nick True made, it is clear that creating and agreeing airspace plans for any new runway would require its own process of public consultation, and that of course is led by the CAA, but we have in fact, as part of the consultation documentation, in the paper about operational efficiency, produced an indicative flight path design for each of the schemes. We have tried to do something, although of course, because that would be a CAA proposal, the modelling, we cannot be absolutely definitive about that at this point. But we have done something there.

We will, as Councillor Govindia suggested, look at what the CAA and the National Air Traffic Service can say about the respite plans and how achievable they are. We are, I hope, picking up the health issues and the point Councillor Puddifoot made about the overall impact of traffic, including the freight traffic, on local roads. That is another thing that we are certainly picking up.

I think those were the main points that were addressed directly at me. I wonder if I could begin – my colleagues may wish to pile in here as well – by picking up one or two of the points that have not really appeared in the morning. Inevitably, given the structure of the day, some of the points you made have been responded to by the promoters already in certain ways. One that has not, I think, is on flooding mitigation. That is a point that has not arisen. John or Jock, do you want to say something about that?

### **Captain Jock Lowe**

Yes, thank you. With a house in Colnbrook where the water got to within one inch of the door in February, I am aware of the issue. I think all that we can propose is to say that we put into our costings and our plans mitigation for that flooding. It is the way that it will probably have most money spent on it, when you look at the distribution of funds from Government. Something does need to be done about the waterways around there. I think both our plans and those of Heathrow Airport Limited include that. It is a big task – I will not minimise it – but clearly there has to be a satisfactory plan put to the Environment Agency and the Government before these plans could go ahead. It is important. I know about it and, yes, our plans do include it, but of course there are many iterations before it is delivered.

### **John Holland-Kaye**

If I could just respond on that for Heathrow, it is actually one of the great opportunities we have. While we are investing £16 billion of private investment, we can have Heathrow fitting better within the local communities it serves. One of the opportunities is, for example, with the Colne Valley. We will be re-landscaping the Colne Valley. That will allow us to provide better flood mitigation. We will be increasing the balancing reservoirs, as an example, which will be able to store water, and putting in other water-storage mechanisms. This is an opportunity that we do not have currently where we can actually make things better for local communities.

**Sir Howard Davies**

Councillor Curran asked in relation to that how you came up with your £550 million. He argued that the mitigation package ought to be better.

**John Holland-Kaye**

The £550 million is about three times what we proposed to invest with the previous third-runway proposal, and it was based on an initial assessment of the kind of noise insulation and insulation for schools that might be needed. What has come out very clearly from the consultations we have been holding over the last few months is that it is not enough. You have raised that point, as have some of your colleagues. We will be responding on that in the New Year. We think there is more that we can do, so we will be responding in terms of what more we can do for schools and what more we can do with insulating people's homes who will be in the flight path. That is in addition to the announcement we made earlier this week, which was to extend the eligibility for people selling their homes locally to those who are on the new airport boundary as well as those who would be affected by compulsory purchase.

**Captain Jock Lowe**

Allow me one plug. Because our scheme is about £5 billion cheaper there is more left over for compensation and mitigation.

**Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you. Jock, can I press you a bit on the noise issues? Ravi Govindia said he was very sceptical about the impact of quieter planes, that your views on that – I guess it probably applies to both schemes – are too optimistic, and that you do not get as much reduction in noise as you are in your modelling taking credit for. How do you respond?

**Captain Jock Lowe**

I have talked to Ravi, and I will show him the simplistic view of how you can get at least eight hours' respite over Wandsworth. Admittedly their head office, with its circular space in the middle, acts like a loudspeaker so nobody gets it more clearly than he does. That is why I showed this morning the slides for Frankfurt, and would have shown some for Chicago and elsewhere. I keep stressing this. We could not have done this five years ago. In 10 years' time, when the modern equipment is operational and it comes in – and really we are not up to full flows on a third runway until 2030 – all the aircraft will have modern equipment. It is simply an input into the flight management system and you fly it. I will put a caveat on that. 5% of the time there are low-visibility procedures and probably for some time they will be straight, but people do not complain about the noise when there is fog or snow. For 95% of the time, we will be able to follow the noise reduction paths. It is already happening.

As for steeper approaches, that in the first instance will be done for the morning flights, but, again, other airports are looking at it. It is the intermediate approach which should be steeper, so that you do a more continuous descent. That does not just drop the decibels by two; it reduces it by 25% on average, depending upon where you are in the flight path. Obviously, if you are one and a half degrees higher out at 20 miles, it is quite a big reduction. I am confident – and I would not be

putting this forward if I did not think and was not sure – that by the time this airport expansion is open we will be doing it. It would be nonsense not to do it. The capability will be there. It will be being done elsewhere.

As I have said earlier this morning, one of the things about your Commission is that it has opened the eyes of the whole industry about the need for controlling – diminishing, reducing – approach noise. On take-off, there are limits. If you ‘ring the bells’, as we call it, you get fined. I think Heathrow are about to put the fines up even more. There is nothing like that on approach, and there should be. If we put some discipline into the approach and into the routes, I am confident, yes, that we can meet all the proposals. Remember that all new aircraft after 2020 have to be like the Boeing 787 or quieter. The faster you expand Heathrow, the more you get newer aeroplanes in quicker.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

John, could I push that to you, but with the specific point about respite? Councillor Govindia said you cannot guarantee this respite that you offer under the new scheme because the dominant concern will always be safety, and when that happens people get landed anyway, therefore this respite is not as firmly guaranteed as it might appear. Can you tell us about how much that happens? Indeed, how would you respond to people who say, ‘Well, you may say that is your aspiration about respite, but there is no way you could actually guarantee that you would deliver that in practice’?

### **John Holland-Kaye**

First of all, the Heathrow proposal to have a new runway to the north is designed from the starting point that we need to be able to secure respite for anyone who lives in the flight path. That is why we have designed it to be a longer runway and further to the west. That allows us to have any planes taking off and landing on that runway and it allows us to give a guarantee of respite for anyone who might be in the flight path. 95% of people who live in the flight path would have respite at least 50% of the time. That is how we have designed our plan.

You can plan respite in a scheduled way. What you cannot plan for is wind direction. We have days when the wind will change from west to east and when we need to change the direction that people are landing. That will trigger a day when people expected to get respite when they will not get respite. That is one of the main factors which makes it harder to predict day to day who will get respite. We track all this through our system so that people can see what they should expect.

In terms of noise more widely, I am glad to hear the comments about the noise blueprint. That was something that I initiated after I took over as chief executive in July, based on the feedback from the councillors, the MPs and the local residents that I had met who said, ‘You need to be doing more today within the abilities that you have’. What I did was to list out all of the things that people said we should be doing: having planes sticking to the continuous-descent approaches; having planes dropping their landing gear as late as possible, in line with our standards; writing to all the airlines who have A320s which make a whistling noise on approach, which is particularly felt 10-20 miles out, and asking them to change their planes so that they reduce that; and also trying to get rid of the remaining noisiest planes in the fleet – the category three planes – which are the ones which have the most impact on the ground. There is less than 1% of those left. Last week I wrote to the chief executives of the 40 airlines who are responsible for those noise impacts on the ground and asked

them to work with us to reduce it. I have had conversations with British Airways, with Star Alliance and with Virgin to help us to work on that, and they are committed to doing so.

Beyond that, you talk about what we can do with NATS and the CAA. We have started those conversations with NATS and the CAA. If we want to fly planes in even steeper, so they are coming in at 3.2 degrees or 3.5 degrees where the standard today is 3 degrees, we will need to work with other agencies, and we have started those conversations. As Jock has said, one of the great advantages of this process is it has triggered us to look at things that maybe have not been looked at for some time and to get on with things we said we would do. Noise insulation in schools, which we aimed to do by the end of summer, will be complete by the end of February, and the ventilation programme for schools will be complete by the end of summer still. We are taking action where we can take action and we are looking ahead to work with NATS and the CAA to improve things longer term.

### **Captain Jock Lowe**

Can I just add to that on the question about safety? I would just ask you to use Google and look up 'ground-based augmentation systems'. The pilot has a television screen in front of him and the GBAS just produces a signal which is exactly like an instrument landing system – the ILS is about 50 or 60 years old – so you can follow whatever path you want down. The thing that needs to change is how the air traffic controllers feed on the radar the aeroplanes onto those tracks. If you want to offset it by half a mile and then join the landing phase later on – you can have as many approach paths as you want, within reason. Safety is not affected, because the pilot, or the autopilot, is just following the same type of display. Clearly you line up at some point. Where that is is up for debate and discussion. To address Ravi, yes, we can offset by half a mile or three-quarters of a mile or 500 metres left or right of the centre of his headquarters in Wandsworth, but the limit, I would suggest, is that we put the outside of that envelope of approach where people are getting noise now. With the new aeroplanes, the funnel should decrease, but if we go to the edge of it then there are no new people getting noise but we are giving respite in eight-hour or four-hour blocks, or whatever blocks you want. It is safe, it is possible and it is already happening. Of course it does require all the aeroplanes having that modern equipment, and that could be one of the conditions.

### **John Armitt**

John, could I ask a point about respite and the issue of surrounding noise? Is it correct to say that it is the airport owner's decision as to which planes and which airlines it will and it will not allow to land, and to the extent that it will or will not allow them to operate in a particular way? While you have written to the 40 airlines, what power are you able, or are you willing, to use to actually insist that in fact they operate in particular ways which would minimise the impacts? Presumably we could get to a point where we have the optimum flight paths, we have the optimum angle of descent, we have the optimum use of undercarriage, and so on. Is it in your power, or does the regulator have an influence over this? Can you actually say, 'Look guys, if you do not do what we ask, you are not going to be landing at Heathrow'?

### **John Holland-Kaye**

Ultimately this comes down to the regulator and the rules that they put in place. I would expect that with any expansion there will be some limitations that are put in place about the way in which

planes fly in. Typically, the way that we deal with airlines that do not from time to time comply with regulations is through fining mechanisms. We have a noise fine, which Jock alluded to earlier, where if aircraft breach the requirements they are fined, and the funds that are raised from those fines go back to local community funding. They fund things like the Iver Scout Hut, which I referred to earlier. It is a way of giving back to the community, and it does have an impact.

We also do what we can as an airport to influence airlines. We incentivise airlines to send their quietest and cleanest planes to Heathrow. We charge more for the noisiest planes and less for the quieter planes, and that has had an impact. If you look at the fleet that airlines fly into Heathrow, it is about 8% quieter than the worldwide aviation fleet. That is going to get better over the next few years. That is primarily because the base carriers – British Airways and Virgin – have started to replace their fleets. The old 747s are being retired; the new 787s and A350s are coming in, which are significantly quieter.

It is very hard to put your finger on the noise benefit of a plane flying 700 feet higher or of moving the landing point on the runway. We need to be able to assess that, so we are working with Arup and their sound lab, who have done a lot of work with High Speed 2, so that we can measure the sound at different points on the flight path of different types of planes and look at the impact of some of the changes that are being talked about so that we can see whether the cumulative effect of all the things we are talking about is making a difference and whether there are some things which have a bigger benefit and we should therefore push for harder and quicker. That will be very helpful. We have started testing that with a 747 flight. We are adding in some of the newer planes to compare with. We actually have the first A350 in commercial service in the world coming in in a few weeks' time, and we will be measuring the impact of that. It is a significantly quieter plan even than the A380. People will be able to see what the future looks like – or hear what the future looks like. In 10 years' time, that will be the fleet that is landing at Heathrow: the A350s, A380s, 787s and A320s. Those will be the planes that we are seeing, not the ones that you have going over your heads today. I would invite anyone on the panel – our council leaders – to come and listen to that and see for yourselves what the impact could be and how much better Heathrow can be as a neighbour in a two-runway or a three-runway world.

### **Captain Jock Lowe**

Could I just add to that, John? One thing that was mentioned earlier but we have not picked up yet is noise on departure. Most aeroplanes only use normal climb power for take-off; very few of them use take-off power for take-off. If they use take-off power, they are much higher before they clear the airport boundary – all of them. That does not happen because it costs a little bit more in engine wear. You actually use less fuel, but it is really not very much. We have the penalties in on departure; we could make the penalties steeper and the noise requirements tighter. We do not have that process on arrival. In other words, you force compliance by pricing. That is the simple answer. It is an easier way than trying to regulate it; you just fine people that do not comply.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Can I raise one other point, which is relevant to the noise issue? That is the night-flights point, which has been mentioned a few times. Jock referred to it a little bit and offered his personal view on it. How important, John, are the night flights to the economics of the airport and of the airlines? Is there an opportunity to reduce night flights further? How does your regime compare with Frankfurt, since that has been raised specifically?

**John Holland-Kaye**

Let me start by just touching on Frankfurt. Frankfurt has a ban on night flights up until 05.00. They then have more flights between 05.00 and 07.00 than we do. It is not comparable to what was described earlier. We have 16 flights that operate between 04.30 and 06.00, which is considered the night-flight period, and typically those are long-haul flights coming from places like Singapore and Cape Town. They are the first wave of the airlines' fleets. They are important commercially. They are the planes coming in which are then turned round to fly out again later in the day, and many of the businesspeople in particular who live in the local community will be on those planes, so it is an important part for them.

What we can do in the meantime – and I have started these conversations with the airlines who fly in that period – is look at what we can do today to improve that. How can we get the noisiest planes – particularly the 747s – out of that night-flight period? We are working with the airlines on how we can do that. In some cases there are changes that they may be able to make; in other cases it is more difficult for them to make changes. For example, on the Cape Town route, the runway at Cape Town is not long enough to take an A380 so British Airways can only fly a 747 on that route. They are commercially important. They are part of the flow of planes coming in and out of the airport. I think there is more we can do to reduce the impact of noise in a two- or three-runway world, but they are an important part of the equation.

**Captain Jock Lowe**

The airlines are not my customers, so I do not have to be as careful. The first point is night-quota flights are up to 06.00. You have 16 flights that, if they do not get in then, will not get in at all. There is no space. Taking the band to 07.00, which one of the councillors mentioned, would be fought enormously. But if you allow more slots after 06.00 to get those flights in, there is less of an issue. You do not need Cape Town to come in at 05.00 or Boston to come in at 05.30. In my view, you could move all the night-quota flights out, but the airlines will concede that as the very last thing, because they are viable financially; they are very lucrative. It is the waves of departures that those flights lead into out of Heathrow and, at the other end, the inbound waves. It would be challenging to them. Yes, it could be done, but only if you have more slots after 06.00 and it applies to everyone. The in-between one is just to get flights in after, say, 05.30 from Singapore and Hong Kong. Why am I using up our time? Because it seems to me, going around, that night-quota flights and the noise they create are half the problem. If we could get rid of those, you would reduce the concern of people quite significantly. While it would be troublesome to the airlines and it will only happen if they got a lot more slots after 06.00, of course it is possible, and the impact on John and Heathrow Airport is quite minimal because the same number of aeroplanes will come in, just a little bit later.

**Julia King**

Could I raise a couple of quick things? Councillor Cox raised the issue of whether any discussions had been held between Heathrow Airport and the local authorities on the additional housing that will be needed – not just the replacements for the homes that will be lost but, of course, for the people who will be brought into the area with the big growth in jobs. It would be useful to hear about that.

Heathrow Airport Limited has talked about bringing in a congestion charge if that is necessary to reduce the road congestion. Clearly, there is some concern about how a congestion charge will

impact on the local residents. Will they have to pay it? Will that make their lives more expensive? Will they be frustrated by that? I would be interested to hear a bit more about how you anticipate that might work. Thank you.

### **John Holland-Kaye**

Thank you. Actually, we have started to have conversations with our local councils on a number of issues, and many of those have come up today: how do we secure high-quality jobs for local people coming to work at the airport? How do we get people to the airport using public transport rather than coming by car? How do we help to deal with the high levels of unemployment that do exist in our local communities? How can we better invest in schools and universities and give training and development to people? This all comes together with an opportunity to give highly-skilled jobs to local people, who we can train up over the coming 10 years, getting kids who are in primary schools now to be able to take on those jobs in the future. They are people who live locally today.

In terms of housing, that is not something that has come up significantly in the conversations we have had so far, but I would like to engage with any of our local councils on how we can best provide housing. This is something we need to work together on. We have started to have those conversations, but we need to do more as we fill out the detail of our plan. But the big prize here is to get highly-skilled local jobs for 40,000 people who are living in our local communities today. That is a huge prize, and we should be working together through schools and colleges to make sure that the exact high-quality jobs that your constituents need are delivered here at Heathrow.

[Heckling]

Just briefly on the congestion charge, public transport links will improve significantly with an expanded Heathrow. We will have three times as many seats on trains alone, with connections to north, south, east and west, as well as the biggest bus-and-coach station in the UK. Many of the things that we heard earlier about increasing the number of bus services in the free bus zone and moving to 24-hour bus services are things that would form part of our plan, and they help to take cars off the road. We have done a lot to reduce the number of cars on the road. The number of people who come to the airport by public transport has moved up from about 30% to over 40% over the last 20 years. With expansion, it would go up to over 55%. The next big opportunity, though, is to continue to reduce the number of people who work at the airport who come by car. All the things we have talked about will help with that, as will relocating the hotels and offices that are currently on the A4 and the Bath Road close to the rail station at T5. That will allow people who work for British Airways and are based to the west to come in by public transport. We know that that works, because we have reduced the number of people who come by car over the last 20 years quite significantly. We have a big car-share scheme and a big cycle scheme to help people get here. That goes to another issue which we have talked about, which is air quality. Getting cars off the road will help to protect the air quality around the airport.

The Commission, with its independent work, has confirmed that we can expand Heathrow without having additional cars on the road. We have proposed a congestion charge as a possibility if we need it in order to control air quality and congestion. It is an emergency step. We do not expect it would be needed before 2030. We would expect that cars which do not pollute, cars for local people and the black cabs coming into the airport would be exempt from that structure. We would largely be trying to reduce the kiss-and-fly traffic, which causes significant congestion around the airport, and this would be one of the mechanisms we could use if we needed to.

**Ricky Burdett**

We have been speaking about it now, but we heard from the councillors how important and what concerns there are across the board, really, on surface transport and its impact. I wanted to ask Jock a question. How significant is the quite innovative notion of the transport interchange hub to the concept of your scheme and, indeed, the viability of your scheme?

**Captain Jock Lowe**

The rail-road plan that we have put forward is, in effect, totally separate from our plan. That rail-road interchange up to the north just was a common-sense thing to do. It was originally chosen as a spot for a potential HS2 station, but they decided to go elsewhere. Our runway plan would work with the transport plan that Heathrow Airport put forward and vice versa. We just thought that putting an integrated transport plan in there which takes traffic away from the airport from the M40, M1 and so on, and makes even better rail connections – not having western rail access but having a station there – was a better plan to get even more people onto the rail and make it easier for those people coming from roads. People coming to the airport from the west would go from the M4 up the spur; similarly from the M40. It is just applying a different solution to the roads and railways, as we did to the runways, but they are not interconnected. Our ATM forecasts and passenger forecasts with the airport do not alter the railway; it just makes it possibly easier.

**Sir Howard Davies**

Could I raise just one last point before we break? That is something that was raised by one councillor and also raised from the floor earlier. That is the accident risk. Does it make sense to have more flights over a highly-congested area? What about the risk of accidents? Jock, I know you have thought about this.

**Captain Jock Lowe**

Yes, I have thought about the safety overall. Let me just repeat, though: the last accident outside the boundary at Heathrow was on 18 June 1974. I have been to lots of airports. Heathrow is, in my view, the safest airport to fly into, for one reason in particular. That is that the air safety mechanisms of air traffic mean that the flight paths are monitored all the way in so that there is very little chance of deviating from it without being picked up. The next one is on the standards of airlines that come in. Because of both the economic benefit of Heathrow and the type of airline that goes in there, they are all top-class airlines with excellent safety records. To be frank, the population density in London is no different to New York. It is certainly a lot less than Sao Paulo, which I go to regularly, where there are 22 million people in the vicinity. It is something that you have to be aware of with all airline operations. I am content that if you introduce strict procedures – actually it may get expensive for the airlines to operate in there – you end up with good-quality aeroplanes and air crew, monitored most carefully.

I know people will mention the 777 that went down. Actually, that was such that if they had opened up the throttles just a few seconds earlier, the ice would have cleared from the engine, so it would not have happened over Hounslow, and if they had been a few seconds later, they would have landed on the runway. Even the worst example was actually showing that the quality of the aircraft and the operation is really pretty good on those aeroplanes. Can there be accidents? Yes. How you would actually [time with terrorists?] to go over central London – well, you could do it



over any city; it is just something that we have to take care of with overt and covert security to try to prevent it.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you very much. I am going to break now for 15 minutes. We are going to thank, however, our councillors for coming along. It is very helpful to have all of you here with interesting different perspectives. I am very grateful to you for taking the time.

[Break]

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you very much for coming back. We are now heading for the last round-up. In this session we are going to hear from three business representatives and then, depending on what they say, possibly a little bit from the promoters again. Then we will finish off with another opportunity for people to comment from the public gallery, so to speak, and I will then wrap up proceedings. Let us begin with the three business representatives. We have Steve Capel-Davies from the Thames Valley LEP, Frank Wingate from West London Business and Geoff French from Enterprise M3 LEP. The order I have written down is Steve Capel-Davies first. Thank you.

## **Business Representatives' Statements**

### **Steve Capel-Davies**

#### **Thames Valley Berkshire LEP**

### **I. Preamble**

Good afternoon. My name is Steve Capel-Davies and I am here today in my capacity as business representative of the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership Forum, as well as Chairman of its Strategic Transport Forum. With the increasing globalisation of our economy, aviation is of the utmost importance to the UK, providing international connectivity, driving national and local economies and allowing the UK to compete and collaborate with the world's largest economies. We therefore endorse the Commission's view, as outlined in its interim report published in December of last year, that the UK will certainly need additional runway capacity in the South East by 2030.

### **II. Local Enterprise Partnerships**

Local Enterprise Partnerships are business-led partnerships, in our case between the private sector, local authorities, the further- and higher-education sectors and the community sector, and they prioritise publicly-funded investment into Thames Valley Berkshire. LEPs are not successor bodies

to Regional Development Agencies. We are small, strategic bodies led by volunteers with a clear remit to design interventions that will drive economic growth.

### **III. Thames Valley Berkshire LEP**

My LEP serves the sub-region that is perhaps better recognised as the M4 corridor. It contains six unitary authorities and these are all well represented on our stakeholder board. With a population of 870,000 and an annual gross value added (GVA) of £30 billion, this sub-region is of enormous importance to the UK. We are one of the few economies that makes a net contribution to Her Majesty's Treasury. A key driver of this economy is our close proximity to Heathrow Airport, which employs over 18,000 of our residents and is instrumental in attracting inward investment from foreign sources. This is demonstrated by the fact that we have the highest proportion of foreign-owned businesses among all 39 LEP areas and well over 200 European or global HQ operations in the sub-region.

I would like specifically to draw attention to the Borough of Slough, which is the district within the LEP area where airport expansion will make real, physical impact. Slough's economic viability is closely linked to the presence of Heathrow, with numerous international headquarters located in the district and 7,000 Slough residents working in airline-related industries. In one ward alone – the Kedermister ward – 587 people are directly employed by Heathrow.

### **IV. The 'Western Wedge'**

Proximity to Heathrow Airport is also a critical economic driver for the wider 'Western Wedge' region, one of the most productive parts of the UK. The area comprises West London and the parts of the South East radiating from London along the M40, the M4, the M3 and the A3. In 2011, the sub-region generated £137 billion GVA, roughly 10% of the UK economy. Like Thames Valley Berkshire, the wider Western Wedge region attracts significant high-value investment, with foreign-owned firms accounting for 40% of the region's total turnover.

## **V. Evidence**

### **1. Economic Assessment**

Last year, in partnership with other LEPs in the Western Wedge, we commissioned an economic assessment of the future proposals for airport expansion in the South East. The report, produced by consultants Regeneris, which had nearly 500 business responses submitted, found that Heathrow directly supports one in every 20 jobs and £6.2 billion of economic activity in the Western Wedge region, numbers that are likely to decline if Heathrow is not expanded. The report also found that 202 of the top 300 companies in the UK are headquartered within a 25-mile radius of Heathrow, many of which may move away if Heathrow's global hub status is not retained. The results also show that by 2040 an expanded Heathrow would add 35,000 jobs and £3.5 billion GVA and productivity benefits worth up to £300 million a year when compared with the do-nothing scenario.

### **2. Local Business Surveys**

In addition to the economic assessment, we have carried out two surveys of local businesses in Thames Valley Berkshire, one in May and one just last week. Our survey in May found that 60% of

businesses note Heathrow as a factor in their initial decision to invest in Thames Valley Berkshire. Equally, the survey carried out last week found that 97% of businesses believe that the economic health of the area is linked to Heathrow Airport and that over one in 10 businesses would be highly likely or likely to move their activities away from Thames Valley Berkshire to another location if Heathrow Airport was unable to expand. This would equate to over 4,000 businesses in Berkshire alone. The surveys that we have conducted are all overwhelming in their conclusions: to support the future expansion of Heathrow and secure its status as the UK's hub airport.

## **VI. Thames Valley Berkshire LEP's Position on Heathrow**

### **1. Overview**

Given the central role that Heathrow clearly plays in the Thames Valley Berkshire economy, we feel that it is imperative that its status as a global hub airport is retained. If it is not, the sub-region's prosperity is likely to decline steadily. We are therefore putting our support behind the option of an expanded Heathrow. This position is made clear in our Strategic Economic Plan, submitted to Government earlier this year. It reiterates the findings of our wider study that even the do-nothing option of maintaining Heathrow's two runways would result in a steady decline in local employment and prosperity.

### **2. Environmental Issues**

Our position is not oblivious to the environmental issues that airport expansion poses, particularly the effects of aircraft noise on local communities. Comprehensive mitigation measures should be employed as a condition of expansion. Our first question is therefore to ask how the scheme promoters will ensure that the critical balance between the economic imperative of extra runway capacity and the need to protect the environment and communities is addressed if the airport is expanded.

### **3. Surface Transport**

We also believe it is crucial to achieve faster, better and more reliable access to Heathrow. We therefore support the call by the Commission to implement immediate measures to improve surface access to the airport. In particular, western rail access to Heathrow must be delivered by the earliest possible date and certainly not later than 2021. Western rail access is a key strategic priority for Thames Valley Berkshire LEP. The second question is: how will the Heathrow scheme promoters accelerate or help to solve the challenge of direct rail access to the airport, regardless of a third runway? What economic benefits will their solutions bring?

## **VII. Inward Investment**

The final message that I wish to convey to the Commission is that the uncertainty surrounding the future of Heathrow is threatening our long-term ability to attract foreign investment and compete as an international economy. Our direct European competitors, which include edge-of-hub-airport areas in Frankfurt, Amsterdam, and Paris, all have clear plans for future economic growth and the capacity for hub airport expansion. The edge-of-hub-airport area near Paris has, for example, major plans for employment and housing, with Charles de Gaulle Airport currently utilising only 71% of its capacity. Heathrow Airport, on the other hand, currently utilises 98% of its capacity. We also

face threats from the large established technology clusters in the US, such as Silicon Valley, and the emerging technology clusters in the East, such as Shanghai and Bangalore, who are competing successfully against Thames Valley Berkshire for high-tech inward investment.

## **VIII. Concluding Remarks**

This is no time for complacency. A decision must be made so that Thames Valley Berkshire and the wider Western Wedge region can continue to compete against the world's established and rising economies, whose ambitions threaten our own.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

When you said you were facing competition from the East, I thought you meant Silicon Roundabout on Old Street, but you went a little bit further east than that.

### **Steve Capel-Davies**

A little bit further east.

## **Frank Wingate**

### **West London Business**

## **I. West London Business**

Thanks, Sir Howard, and thanks to the Commission for inviting us along this afternoon. West London Business is the chamber of commerce for the whole of West London. We represent more than 800 direct and affiliated businesses here. We engage with 6,000 or 7,000 businesses each year through our events, our databases and our communications. We represent a group representing Park Royal with another 2,000 business on there, and many of the major blue chips are members of ours. We do think we have a finger on the pulse of the business community.

## **II. Position on Heathrow**

We have consistently supported expansion at Heathrow, and our members, through various surveys in recent years, do support expansion with a majority of at least two-thirds. Recent surveys by our colleagues at Hounslow and Hillingdon chambers show similar support. The business community has been quite firmly behind this for some time.

When we sit here giving the business case, of course, it is not to say that we are not conscious and sympathetic to the environmental concerns. Many of our members are residents of West London and we know there are sensitive issues. Our view is that expansion comes with conditions – we have always said that to our colleagues at Heathrow – and we encourage the boroughs and the environmental groups to work with Heathrow, because we think it is not zero-sum game. I think we can have the business benefits and we can mitigate and solve some of the environmental problems as well. That is our view.

### **III. The Business Case for Expansion**

#### **1. Economic Benefits**

Why do we support Heathrow? What is the business case? We think that hub growth is the best for us here in the West London economy, which is a £37 billion economy. It is bigger than many countries. That is just the six boroughs of West London. It is good for the sub-region, including my colleagues either side, who are part of the bigger Heathrow economy. More importantly, I think it is good for the country. I think Heathrow expansion is not just something directly affecting us but it is a national issue and it needs to be looked at in that way. We believe that no expansion would mean losing out to competition overseas. No expansion would mean we would go backwards, not stay where we are. We are not against Gatwick Airport by any means. It is a fine airport. It has its role, but it is not a hub airport and it is not an option.

Let me just look at three areas quickly. I do not want to reel off lots of statistics – Steve has given you a few already – but let us take a very quick look at jobs, supply chain and inward investment.

#### **2. Jobs**

There are 76,000 jobs on the airport and over 100,000 direct jobs outside. There are many more in the supply chain. Expansion at Heathrow will help grow this and it will help local employment by something like 10-20,000 jobs at least. We know the problems with unemployment at the moment and we have a duty to our coming generation. Expansion will mean a major inroad into local youth employment as well. No expansion at Heathrow, or expansion elsewhere, will mean for us employment stagnation or worse.

Steve mentioned the Regeneris research. We were involved and partnered them on that. West London and the Thames Valley together contribute 10% of the UK GDP. Just think about that. 10%. If we invest here, we are investing in that, and at least 200,000 direct jobs are involved there. This area is like an engine for the UK economy, along with Thames Valley.

#### **3. Supply Chain**

This probably speaks for itself, but the number of hotels, hospitality, logistics, transport companies, food companies and IT companies that work around indirectly through the supply chain with Heathrow must be obvious to all. We are talking about thousands of jobs again. Expansion means further growth and further development, but if we do not expand Heathrow, with dwindling air routes and with dwindling business the long-term picture is a picture of decline.

#### **4. Inward Investment**

West London is second only to Central London in terms of attracting international business. Again, I could reel off lots of big brand names we have here, but people like Coca-Cola, HP, Cisco, Sky and Microsoft would not be here in West London if it were not for Heathrow. The Golden Mile area, with its 25,000 jobs; Stockley Park; Bedfont Lakes; Park Royal I mentioned; and other business clusters not totally but largely have growth because of Heathrow. Again, if we do not grow Heathrow, we suffer the serious problem that many of these businesses would move, and new investment certainly will not come here. Why would they? They will go to Schiphol or Frankfurt or other competitive hub airports in Europe, where they can fly to their international markets,

because the main reason that decides where international companies go these days is access to their international markets.

#### **IV. Freight**

Freight is very important to UK trade. Freight actually accounts for 40% of our total international trade. This is an incredible figure. Two-thirds of that trade goes through Heathrow. That is high-value trade and flying in the holds of passenger flights. It is a very important ingredient of UK trade and we need to nurture that, because that is where Britain's export trade will grow.

The UK urgently needs to boost manufacturing and exporting to rebalance our economy. We have heard that a lot lately. To export, we must connect with emerging markets – our long-haul markets such as China and Brazil. We do 20 times the trade with countries that we fly directly to nowadays than with the countries we do not fly to. That speaks for itself. We need to expand to increase our trade. As an example, Germany exports £73 billion to China at the moment; the UK exports £10 billion. That is because they have that kind of number of flights daily to Chinese cities and we are just falling behind.

#### **V. Concluding Remarks**

My conclusion is this, quite simply. For the West London economy, this could add billions of pounds. For the West London and Thames Valley engine to continue its contribution, we need Heathrow expanded. For the UK economy to develop in the future, we need Heathrow to expand. We need expansion at our existing hub airport. Gatwick is not an option and no expansion is not an option. Thank you.

### **Geoff French**

#### **Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership**

#### **I. The Enterprise M3 LEP**

Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Geoff French and I am Chair of the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership. That is the LEP that covers most of Hampshire and Surrey. It stretches all the way from the M25 down to the New Forest and includes about 14 district councils. It is home to 1.65 million people and supports 90,000 businesses. That is almost 22% of the total number of firms in the South East region. Those firms between them employ about 760,000 people, with a GVA of about £42.7 billion a year. This is an economy that our businesses tell us depends on strong links to the UK's international airports, especially Heathrow, and where the lack of aviation capacity is viewed as limiting growth.

## **II. Position on Heathrow**

### **1. Overview**

I would like to start by endorsing much of what Steve from the Thames Valley Berkshire LEP has just said. The importance of airport capacity to the economy, which he has eloquently outlined, applies equally to the Enterprise M3 area. It is clear that without an increase in capacity at Heathrow the economy of our area will be adversely affected. For this reason, Enterprise M3 believes that the Commission's recommendation should be for the provision of a single hub airport at Heathrow.

### **2. Jobs**

The impact of Heathrow airport is felt throughout the whole area. Some 9,700 residents of the Enterprise M3 area work at Heathrow, about 14% of the total Heathrow workforce, and we know that people travel to work at Heathrow from as far away as the New Forest. We have noted the Commission's assessment that up to 180,000 jobs could be created, including catalytic impacts, with expansion at Heathrow. If we assume a similar percentage coming from the Enterprise M3 area as at present, this could mean up to 25,000 jobs are created for Enterprise M3 area residents. We also note the Commission's assessment that 14,000 local jobs could be lost if expansion at Heathrow does not proceed.

Our area includes the district of Spelthorne that abuts the southern boundary of Heathrow Airport and, understandably, is most directly affected by any expansion proposals. 3,900 local residents are directly employed by Heathrow and 3,500 other jobs in Spelthorne are in related industries.

### **3. Strategic Economic Plan**

Overall, Enterprise M3 is one of the highest-performing economies in the UK on a wide range of measures: employment rate; skills; output per head; and household income. A key factor that underpins the success of the area is its proximity to London and Heathrow Airport.

Our Strategic Economic Plan, published in March 2014, sets out our vision for growth. In this we recognise the importance of Heathrow and provide a compelling rationale as to why investment in the Enterprise M3 area improves the economy for local people and businesses as well as the national economy. It is one of the strongest and most resilient local economies in the country and is a location that offers opportunities for growth. We are aiming to provide the right environment to create this new growth, additional jobs and significant new export markets.

### **4. Obstacles to Growth**

Steve again has already explained why proximity to Heathrow Airport is a critical economic driver for the Western Wedge region. However, as he has noted, this success could easily be eroded by a range of problems that threaten to stall our growth. One of those is the lack of capacity and connectivity at Heathrow. Local businesses regularly tell us that proximity to Heathrow is a significant factor in their decision to be located in the Enterprise M3 area. We also know from discussions with businesses that they need certainty and the lack of a decision on airport capacity is affecting their long-term planning and is seen as a negative factor for companies looking to locate

in the area. Equally, they would look to relocate away from our area if the airport no longer provided the services and facilities they need.

### **III. Economic Benefits**

#### **1. Overview**

We have concluded in our Strategic Economic Plan that there is a need to expand capacity at Heathrow, to maintain its status as the UK's hub airport, through the provision of additional runway and terminal capacity, with associated surface-access improvements. This is fundamental to supporting jobs and attracting and retaining businesses within our area.

We firmly believe that expanding UK hub capacity at Heathrow would result in significant benefits to the UK economy. Those are the things you have already heard: increased connectivity to new and emerging international markets and facilitating business travel by staff of the multinational companies that are located in our area. The key positive competitive effect of expanding Heathrow will be the UK's ability to retain business that would otherwise be lost to other places in Europe and worldwide and to make the UK increasingly attractive for trade and foreign investment.

#### **2. Spelthorne**

In talking about that, I want to specifically highlight the Borough of Spelthorne. Spelthorne is home to a high concentration of company headquarters, with over 4,500 businesses located there. These include BP; a company that employs 4,500 people in Spelthorne alone, with global connections, and who train 3,000 staff and 1,000 students per year there through their Upstream Learning Centre, with an obvious need to fly people in and out through Heathrow. Heathrow is vitally important to the local economy, with over 8% of Spelthorne residents working at Heathrow airport. Any degradation of this role would have catastrophic effects for the area. The LEP also works closely with Heathrow Airport to encourage the development of skills through the Heathrow Academy, which last year trained just over 1,000 people and put 525 into work, thus helping the airport to attract and retain businesses by providing access to suitably trained staff.

### **IV. Surface Access to Heathrow**

Enterprise M3 wants the public transport modes improved significantly. We all know the reasons for that. Improved connectivity to Heathrow by rail in particular would help to reduce airport-related traffic on the strategic road network, improve journey-time reliability for airport users and offer a viable and sustainable alternative to travel by car. The need for fast, efficient and reliable rail links to Heathrow Airport has been regularly highlighted as a priority in both business surveys and economic analysis.

We support the western rail access to Heathrow project, which Steve has spoken about, as this will improve rail access to Heathrow from north Hampshire via Reading. We also strongly advocate the need to improve rail access to and from the South and South West and therefore urge the scheme promoters to address the need for appropriate solutions for southern rail access to Heathrow. Such a transformational long-term project will enable employees and passengers to access the airport more easily, thus reducing traffic and enhancing the connectivity of our area, Enterprise M3, and its businesses to Heathrow. This is why it is one of the key strategic transport priorities contained in our Strategic Economic Plan.



## **V. The Airports Commission Process**

Finally, I have just a little to say about the process which is being followed to determine the way forward in terms of airport capacity in the South East. We are pleased that the principle that increased capacity is needed has been widely accepted, but it is important that the uncertainty about where this capacity will be is removed as soon as possible. We therefore urge all involved to make a firm decision as soon as possible once the Airports Commission final report is published. It is equally important that the criteria by which a final decision is made are based on sound economic principles and that environmental issues are given full consideration. A robust, long-term solution is required.

## **VI. Gatwick**

This session is all about Heathrow, but I would like to very briefly mention Gatwick as well. As I started by saying, we believe there is a place for one hub airport in the South East and that should remain at an expanded Heathrow. However, we think that Gatwick has a role to play as a point-to-point-focused airport.

## **VII. Questions**

I have two questions at the end of that for the scheme promoters. The first relates to the southern rail access to the airport. We would like to hear the promoters' views on the importance of this in relation to their plans and what they will do, working with the rail industry, to ensure it is delivered before their expansion proposal is operational.

Secondly, I have highlighted the importance of an expanded Heathrow to the local economy in Spelthorne, but inevitably there will be an environmental impact in this area too. The LEP would therefore like to hear how the scheme promoters will ensure the environment in this area is protected while developing Heathrow. Thank you very much.

# **Responses**

## **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you to the three speakers. Inevitably, after seven hours of discussion, quite a lot of the points you made have been brought up before, but I think there were a couple of areas where it would be useful to hear a bit more from the promoters. The most obvious one is the one you just mentioned about rail access. I think there are two dimensions to this: the southern rail access, which is a little bit further in the future; and the western rail access, which is more imminent. These also have environmental dimensions, obviously, because they relate to the way in which people will get access to the airport, which in turn has an effect on air quality, etc. John, I wonder if you could comment specifically on those two: where you are on western rail access and how you see the medium-to-longer-term prospects for a southern route.

**John Holland-Kaye**

I think they are both exciting opportunities. At the moment, we are fantastically well connected into London – we will be even better connected with Crossrail and the Piccadilly Line upgrade – but we need to make it easier for people to get to the airport, whether they are working or travelling, from other parts of our community. Western rail access we are strong supporters of. We are strong supports of southern rail access. We are working with Network Rail on both of those and we are keen to push both of those through. Our plans assume that western rail access will happen but they are not dependent upon southern rail access happening. We think it is a vital way of connecting all of London and getting people to the airport more quickly. We have a lot of people who work at the airport who live on that line down through Staines and through to Richmond and lots of travellers who would like to use that route, so we are strong promoters, as we have been for many years.

I should just add that this is a transformational opportunity. Heathrow will be right at the heart of the UK's transport infrastructure. It has never been that way before. We have always been a little bit on the side of things, very well connected by motorway, with the M3, M25, M4, M40 and M1 giving people lots of choices, but connecting to north, south, east and west by rail will transform the role that Heathrow plays in our national transport infrastructure, and that will be of particular benefit for local people, who can get to the airport more easily. Many people want to get out of their cars and use public transport. We have seen that where we have invested in the Heathrow Express line people have chosen to use that. This is another transformational opportunity that will get cars off local roads and off our motorways and help improve air quality. We are very supportive of public transport.

**Sir Howard Davies**

The other theme that emerged, particularly from Steve and Frank this time, was the importance of the freight business at Heathrow, and the figures for the proportion of exports by value that go through Heathrow's freight function is quite impressive. Can you say something about how you would expect to see that business expand but also, perhaps, pick up a point that came up in the councillors session that we did not get to at the end of that session, which is whether you have properly modelled the impact on the road network of an expanded freight operation? These two things pull slightly in different directions, but how is it going to expand, and how is that expansion going to be managed in the light of its impact on the local community were you to get the go-ahead?

**John Holland-Kaye**

Over a quarter of all the UK's exports go in the holds of passenger planes flying round the world. Those are effectively the trading routes that keep Britain one of the world's great economies, and that is one of the things that we need to not just protect but also develop through the expansion of Heathrow. Quite a lot of that freight comes in by air. The planes from Newcastle – seven a day – are packed with [air supports?]. We will be extending those, so we will have more of the freight coming in by air, but we will also have more coming in by road.

The opportunity here is to design our road network so that we can minimise the impact of expansion of freight. We can do that by organising the location and layout of the freight facilities. As you will know, they are scattered all over the airport. We can organise them in a much better way. One of the innovative things that we are looking at is whether we can do a kind of milk round, where we pick up freight from a number of organisations and bring it in to the airport

together, to reduce the number of vehicles on the road. That is something that we do today for deliveries into the airport itself; it is something that we could extend to the freight side of the business as well. There is a great opportunity to transform something which is very messy and has developed organically and make sure it works really efficiently. We are working with the freight organisations and with Segro, who manage a lot of the facilities, to make sure we have a strong and vibrant freight offer. We are working with local councils to make sure that that sits comfortably with the local communities.

### **Captain Jock Lowe**

Can I just add to that, Sir Howard? Just a little word of caution is that high-value goods, which is mainly what goes through Heathrow, can go belly hold. Historically, and I do not see it changing, freighters – purely freight – tend to be older and noisier. Before we start bringing 747-800 freighters into Heathrow, we should think very carefully about it, because it will be a high-volume load. They can go to Stansted or Gatwick. What we have to do is get the right balance so that they do not go, like the passengers could do as well, to Amsterdam, Frankfurt and Paris. It is fantastic the amount of high-value-goods stuff that goes through Heathrow but we should not use up slots with noisy and big aeroplanes. That would be my little word of caution.

### **John Holland-Kaye**

Just to be clear, we have no intention of expanding the number of dedicated freight planes coming through Heathrow. Our business plan is based entirely upon extending the number of routes that planes can get to and increasing freight capacity by doing so, using the cargo holds of passenger planes.

### **Sir Howard Davies**

Thank you. We now have time for some more comments from the floor. I am going to bias myself initially towards people who have not made a comment before.

## **Public Gallery Statements**

### **Neil Keveren, Chairman, Stop Heathrow Expansion**

My name is Neil Keveren and I am the current Chairman of Stop Heathrow Expansion. I do not get paid. I am losing money today. I was born in Sipson and I live in Harmondsworth. I am not interested in money or compensation. I am integral to this area. We are a true grassroots group. The funding we have had so far would not buy two wrap-around adverts by Back Heathrow that profess to be front-page news. Our total budget would not cover that so far. Alan Hayes, the editor of the *Gazette*, apologised to me for that wrap-around advert at our launch, and you may struggle to get another one the same way again.

Sir Howard, John Holland-Kaye, now you want something we have an apology. On behalf of the residents here, your apology is not accepted. It is not good enough. Thank you very much. The

sound measures that you speak of. We have a right to conversation in our gardens. Our children have the right to play in the garden and breathe air. Air conditioning in a sealed school. Let them get out. Let them play in peace. Our elderly in the village – there are some that will not go. These burly men here, the police, bailiffs, Nigel Milton perhaps – whoever – you come and remove Audrey from her house. Please be there. Do not be somewhere nice else. When it boils down to it, the people of this country will not bear to see burly people lifting out our elderly or compulsory purchase by foreign companies. If you were to be an alien and look anywhere in this country without a commercial interest and put a finger where you would put one of the busiest airports in the world, it would not be here. It has evolved here; we suffer it here. We do not want Heathrow to close – we have never said that – but no bigger. Enough is enough.

Every time Nigel speaks, our numbers grow. The more and more people realise they are on a flight path and they are being affected and their air quality, our numbers will grow further. When the time comes, this will not be deliverable. In the meantime, Jock, your pension is going up. There are people in Colnbrook whose pension and retirement is cancelled. All their life they have wanted to retire to the coast. They cannot sell their houses now, which are blighted on the strength of a doodle of an entrepreneur and a few landowners. A doodle. Blighted.

There is no longevity in my family. When I retire, if I want to move to the coast, I need to get there quick. Six and 10 years, they are being told, before any buy-up. I would not have the chance to change the wallpaper in that time. They need to have the right to get where they need to go and be integrated.

We have a manifesto pledge from the Conservative Government saying, ‘No ifs, no buts. No third runway.’ ‘The last chance to stop more pollution.’ The Prime Minister believes there will be more pollution. We believe there will be more pollution. ‘The last chance to stop more noise overhead.’ There will be more noise overhead. You are tweaking a flight path; you will tweak a level and take off more steeply. There will be more noise. There will be more pollution. And the Prime Minister said, ‘The last chance to protect your local way of life’. I could vote for a man like that, but what he has chosen to do is, having made a manifesto pledge, give it to Sir Howard – who is doing a grand job; thank you, sir – to deliver it after the next election. This process circumnavigates the process of democracy.

That is enough from me. All I will say is that we are just starting. Would all these councils with very strong opposition please unite? We will be there again. We can do this. Be strong and do get in touch with [the sheet?] and join our group. Thank you.

### **Eilish Stone**

I am a Harmondsworth resident. At a lecture at Brunel University last week, Mr Holland-Kaye told those present, many of us students, that people around the airport want a better life for their children. No disagreement there. I live in the beautiful historic village of Harmondsworth, which existed long before Heathrow was created. We too want a better life for our children, where they can learn free from aircraft noise, not in pods to protect them only from noise at playtime, and where they can breathe without fear of permanent health damage from air pollution. We want them to understand the needs of the economy and to value and cherish their history. Too much is taken from our heritage which can never be replaced.

We were told that Heathrow has been full for the last 10 years, but we all know that many of the planes are not full – a management issue, not an economic issue. We are told 750 homes will be

demolished, but now it is recognised that hundreds more would be rendered uninhabitable, hence their inclusion in the so-called compensation scheme. Think about the number of people – yes, real people – many elderly and alone, suffering stress and despair at the prospect of losing their home where for some generations have lived. There is a housing shortage in Hillingdon. Where will we live? Education will be disrupted, jobs lost for some through displacement, families and friends separated and communities cleansed from the area so Heathrow can fly to Asia and South America. China, apparently, is the acid test, according to Mr Holland-Kaye. If they are not doing business in China, it seems they are doomed. Well, we are doomed by your plans for expansion at Heathrow and our human rights ignored. I say a resounding no to expansion and will fight you to the bitter end to save my home in Harmondsworth and to save the threatened surrounding communities.

### **Audience Member**

I firstly just want to thank you, Sir Howard, for giving a local resident the opportunity to speak. I definitely agree with everything that has been discussed today. I am definitely in favour to back Heathrow; however, the key word being ‘conditional’. With respect to the many conditional views that have been given today with respect to the mitigation of floods and mitigation of local communities, I definitely agree with everything, but I think there is one point which has not been discussed. This is with respect to future pricing of potential flights. We have addressed the issues that you have commented on with respect to how the economy is moving at such a great pace that we need future flights. However, what I would like to highlight is that we are in a very tough economic climate and I am sure many in this room would agree with me that – dare I say – if I ever want to travel, rather than commuting via Heathrow, I have explored commuting via Gatwick, primarily on the grounds of price. With this grave investment that is going to be done in Heathrow, I can for one side say, ‘I have this great Heathrow hub airport close to home’, but it would be a grave shame if I am not in a position to travel because the prices are extortionate.

[Heckling]

You have mentioned to an extent that with [inaudible] you will fine airlines, but it would be a shame if those airlines are just passing on the prices to local residents who wish to fly. I know it is difficult for you to answer this now, but is there any sort of assurance that you can give with respect to any future airlines that will be charging prices to people that they will not be extortionate?

[Heckling]

There will be certain monopoly airlines that, from Heathrow, will be the only direct flights. Is there any sort of comment you can give on that?

### **[Mike Clarke?], Back Heathrow**

I have sat here through today and I have listened to the impassioned pleas of the people for and against. I can fully understand the people that are against it, and the reasons that they are. But what we have to realise is that this is a business. This is not just Heathrow; it is a big, big business. With businesses, there is the downside and the upside. The upside of Heathrow is that it provides thousands of people with a good life because of the fact that they work there. The downside is you have the pollution and you have the noise.

[Heckling]

Let me finish. We have heard the people who have said, 'We do not want bigger; we want smarter'. Do you not think that over the years Heathrow has been working smarter?

[Heckling]

Hang on a minute. It had Terminal 4 so that it could handle the lift in passengers. That lift then surpassed Terminal 4, so they put in Terminal 5, not necessarily getting bigger but working smarter, to contain the extra within the same site. Now, they have just rebuilt Terminal 2, again to double the capacity of what that terminal gets. These are patches. They will only work for so long. There comes a situation at the end where you cannot go any further so you have to get bigger. Thank you.

### **Natasha Fletcher, Teddington Action Group**

Hello. I am Natasha Fletcher from Teddington. I created a group a week ago called Teddington Action Group in response to what I can describe as an assault on parts of Teddington that has put people under enormous stress who are very worried about the future. I have a lot of things to say. I am nervous. I am not paid millions. I am not a politician. I am a housewife from Teddington. About three weeks ago, I was pro-expansion. I am a result of Heathrow; my parents both worked in Cromwell Road in the 60s and they met there. I am not an anti-Heathrow person. However, in the last three weeks we have lost trust in Heathrow. They do not respond to our complaints; they do not advise us of trials that they take out on us without any warning or explanation. We do not know what the future holds for our children. We are really worried about the health effects. We have looked into studies that were published 10 years ago that show that children under flight paths are heavily affected by noise. I also believe that pollution has a part to play.

I am drying up here. I just want to get the message across that this is meant to be a public consultation. I feel that a lot of people in Teddington did not even know about this today. They could not even get a ticket. They are empty now, these seats. There is no press here. We do not have a voice. The Back Heathrow campaign are pretending to be a grassroots campaign. They are not. I am sorry; I am not taking all these lies. I want to trust you, Heathrow. I want to trust you with my children's future. Can you assure me that my children's education and health will not be compromised by what you have in store for us without us having any control and without knowing what is going to happen? Even your respite plans – I am sorry; that is like Abu Ghraib. Knowing that something is going to happen does not actually make it any better when you are woken up in the middle of the night or even at 06.00. It is not fair. I am not a NIMBY. I have lived in Hounslow; I have lived in Chiswick. I have lived along the flight path before, but I have never experienced this kind of stress and mental torture that you are inflicting on us in Teddington. I would like it if you could for once answer our complaints without us having to wait. Well, we have not even got an answer. I would love to be able to meet you, John, and discuss our future with you. Please promise me that we are going to be okay in Teddington, and all over London – all the people that are going to be affected. This noise contour does not include us. We are not on the map. Apparently we are not suffering from a continued assault which was meant to finish on 12 November but, due to easterly winds, we are still experiencing highly unusual flight patterns which we have never experienced before.

### **Paul Britton, Head of Inward Investment, Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce**

I am a Windsor resident, so I can sympathise with some of the comments, but I have also been working with international companies for the last 15 years to try to encourage them to grow their business and employ more people in the Thames Valley area – Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and

Oxfordshire. I just wanted to put some flesh on the bone as to what the LEP representatives were saying about competition. Never in the 15 years I have been working have I seen a more competitive environment for attracting investment from overseas. The way that companies are internationalising has changed. They are internationalising earlier in their growth. They are looking for better connectivity. Of course, the origin of this investment is changing quickly – more from emerging markets. The comment I would make is that we have a huge opportunity here. If we can get a well-connected Heathrow, both in the UK and overseas, we will attract those businesses that we are currently losing the investment from due to the ongoing uncertainty and competition from elsewhere. I would encourage you to think about the missed opportunities that I am dealing with week in, week out as a result of this continuing uncertainty. Thank you.

### **Christopher Durkin**

Sir Howard, Commission members and promoters, I am here to represent myself and my family and friends who live and work in the area. My name is Christopher Durkin and I was born on 19 December 1944 in Twickenham under the flight path some 25 years after the first regular air service from Hounslow – not Heston, not Heathrow but Hounslow. 1944 was the year the two main runways were being built. I was born under and have lived under London's airport runways all my life. There was a brief spell in 1972 when I bought my first house in Feltham, not out of choice but out of necessity; the houses were simply less expensive there. As soon as I was able to, I moved back to the Hounslow/Whitton borders, once again right under the flight path. I have lived in the same house now for 28 years and intend to live there for the rest of my life, however long that may be.

As a youngster, I recall going to visit my auntie in Hayes together with my father. What an adventure that always was. We sat on top of the bus which drove right through Heathrow Airport looking at all those beautiful old aircraft such as the Boeing Stratocruiser and Lockheed Super Constellation, right through to the brilliant but ill-fated Comet. There was a book published in 1956 called *The Complete Guide to London Airport* by Sir Miles Thomas, which has this comment: 'To Britain falls the honour of having inaugurated the first international passenger air services'. At 09.00 on 25 August 1919 – that is some 95 years ago – the company called AT&T (Aircraft Transport and Travel company) flew the first scheduled flight to Paris. My point is that this occurred 95 years ago, before any of us were here.

I am totally in favour of Heathrow expansion because it creates a vast amount of jobs and therefore wealth. Many people I know, including my family members and friends, rely upon it for their livelihoods. If we do not build a third runway, we will continue to lose business to Charles de Gaulle, Schiphol and Frankfurt. A third runway would bring respite and lessen aircraft noise and pollution by eradicating stacking and creating an ever-cleaner atmosphere. The reason I wake up at about 04.00 is due to my aged plumbing system, nothing to do with flights from the Far East.

[Applause]

The original London Airport was here before we came into the area, so if you are unhappy about it, why not contemplate moving to a fantasy island in the Thames Estuary? Thank you.

### **Audience Member**

We have heard a little bit about history there, and the lady at the front actually mentioned the First World War 100 years ago. I will step you back another 100 years to the early 1800s. At that time,

the big debate was slavery. The pro-slavery campaign was very similar to what we are hearing today. It was that if slavery was not allowed to continue and flourish then business would suffer and the UK would die. It also had the same argument that all the slave trade would go overseas. I am very glad that I live in a country that decided to abolish slavery.

### **Cllr Ruth Cadbury, London Borough of Hounslow**

I live in and represent Brentford Ward. I am also a member of the schools noise insulation scheme and a member of HACAN. I support the 'better, not bigger' perspective of most of the council leaders, including our own, because I feel that Heathrow has reached the limit of its sustainability and the balance has to be struck somewhere. There is the quality of life of 300,000 households under the existing flight paths of 55 Leq, and then there is an additional 83,000 households who will live under the expanded equivalent contour. You need to think of their conditions. Those numbers are important, because if we use that contour, it is the same contour that is being used for City Airport and Paris to get a basic insulation scheme. The vast majority of those people get nothing – no insulation at all. To say that the schools noise insulation scheme will have its work complete next year is rubbish. No new school building, of which there are loads now because of the increased population, built after 2002 is eligible for the scheme, no non-teaching space is eligible for the scheme, and, with the exception of some adobe buildings in the playground, there is not a lot of respite for the children in those schools and no help for schools in a noisy environment outside the carefully-defined contour. There is a lot of work to do on that alone.

Of course the needs of business are important. We are a thriving economy in West London. Outside of Central London we are the next most successful economy in the UK. But there is an awful lot that business could do, working with Heathrow, to improve business connectivity. At present, only 30% of passengers at Heathrow are business passengers; the rest are leisure. You can get a tourist flight to just about anywhere from Heathrow and an awful lot of flights every day to the most popular destinations, such as New York and so on. There is a conversation to be had about the use of the five London airports and the London economy and the connectivity with the rest of the world, but it does not need runway three affecting 400,000 homes to deliver that expanded connectivity, just a better debate and a better engagement. Somebody mentioned competition, but intelligent engagement between the aviation industry and the economic drivers could actually provide that world connectivity without an additional runway at Heathrow. Thank you.

### **Alan Smith**

Sir Howard, Commission. My name is Alan Smith. I live in Wraysbury. I have done for 17 years. Like Chris back there, I have lived locally and under flight paths all my life. I do not find that a huge problem, as, obviously, a lot of people here do. I am founder and director of Mixed Freight Services, which we formed in 1982, which is a road haulage company that provides the road side of air freight on and around Heathrow and all over the country. Heathrow is situated in the perfect position for the cargo that runs up and down the country and comes in and out of the country by air. I might also add that I do not know quite how aware people are but the amount of air freight that goes out by road on foreign hauliers because there is not enough space on the aeroplanes contributes to a huge amount of traffic travelling between Heathrow and all the hub airports in the rest of Europe. I believe also that if Heathrow were to decline, the livelihoods of people and the number of people working on the airport would be considerably declined. Therefore, we need Heathrow; we need Heathrow to expand, and we need that to happen quickly, please.



**Audience Member**

I heard someone mention that we have just turned up. We have not just turned up. Communities have been here for 1,400 years. It is Heathrow that has just turned up. Never forget it. That is one thing.

I have to say the business leaders are doing a shambles of a job. When you talk about China, we have a £20 billion trade deficit with China, so what we need to do is keep you off those flights, because you are going to make it worse. [It is quite a moment?] for you three. I have some more comedy as well. Today, we have had a statement from the only political party in this country that supports Heathrow expansion. I will read it out to you. ‘Alan “Howling Laud” Hope, the Chairman of the Monster Raving Loony Party, says the Loonies support Heathrow expansion.’ So, vote Loony for insanity and third and fourth runways. I think that says it all.

I am not done yet. I used to be a supporter of Back Heathrow. I heard they were a grassroots organisation. I have since found out, confirmed by the Heathrow guy, [Matt Gormley?], that they are funded by the airport and the aviation industry, and some liar called Rob Gray – yeah, you – is actually an aviation lobbyist. I do not support Back Heathrow anymore. I support Stop Heathrow Expansion. I am a local person and I will fight to keep where I live. Thank you.

**Audience Member**

Good afternoon. Thanks for letting me speak. I am a local resident. I am also one of the parliamentary candidates for the Hayes and Harlington constituency. Firstly, I would like to say to the business leaders over there: Sir Howard is looking into a hub airport. You are talking about flights from the local areas for businesses flying direct to China and new markets. That is not the purpose of a hub airport; that is point-to-point flight. Obviously, Heathrow is supposed to be a new hub, not point-to-point.

The other thing you mentioned was the amount of extra business that Germany is doing with China compared to us. You have to look at the differences between the German economy and the British economy. Germany is a major manufacturing player. We are not anymore. We are supposed to be looking at doing high-tech industry. You are looking at things like telecommunications and computing. What you should be pushing for if you want to support those kinds of businesses are improved communication links. I actually work for a multinational company. We have offices in 50 different countries around the world. When our people need to talk to our suppliers abroad and we need to negotiate deals, a lot of the time we do it via videoconferencing link. In England, we have some of the worst communications infrastructure in Europe. We are well behind the rest of Europe and the emerging economies in terms of developing 4G mobile communications and also high-speed broadband. By putting the money into that rather than putting public money into improving infrastructure around an already overcrowded area, you could actually improve business.

As has already been said, there is far too much in the way of point-to-point traffic that is non-business. Unlike a lot of the places in Europe that have major hub airports, in London we have numerous airports. That point-to-point traffic for consumer purposes could be dealt with by Stansted, Gatwick, Luton, Southend or – something that my party supports – a reopened and improved Manston, which could also be used for a lot of the freight traffic – not the high-value freight traffic that Back Heathrow and Heathrow Airport Limited are talking about, but the bigger freight traffic. The money would be better spent on improving the infrastructure road-wise around there and linking HS1, the Channel Tunnel link, up to the airport. Then you could split the traffic

between Heathrow and Manston and you could have business travellers in Central London from Manston via HS1 in 45 minutes. That is faster than coming from Heathrow to Paddington and then having to fight your way across to the City.

### **Audience Member**

I am a councillor for Windsor and Maidenhead but I am also the Chairman of the Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council, which comprises 20 councils, most of whom are represented here. I would like to take the opportunity to speak about the problems reflected on the rural communities, but I will not do so; I will address a couple of things which affect everybody.

First of all, it is difficult to comprehend talk of the decline of Heathrow when every commentator we hear tells us aviation is increasing year by year. That is a contradiction. We talk of expansion, expansion, expansion, but there are no proposals by anybody for where the hundreds of thousands of extra workers are going to live. Ages ago, when I was a parish councillor, I was involved in consultation on the Berkshire Structure Plan, long-since scrapped. I remember then that the business community addressed that panel and said, 'Please put a brake on development' because the cost of working in the Thames Valley area, with too few houses and very bad infrastructure, was very uneconomical and it was not viable to run businesses because workers had to come in from a long way and they had to be paid a premium to come and work in the area. If you are not going to have extra housing, where on earth are the people going to come from? Are you going to press the Government to repeal the National Planning Policy Framework, which protects our green belt? All of you, I think, appreciate going out there and getting a bit of fresh air. That will be the only way to accommodate 70,000 extra houses.

There is talk about enhancing the southern region connectivity. I do not know how many people have ever travelled on a southern region train. They rattle across level crossings every couple of hundred yards almost, and one on the A30 at Sunningdale currently holds traffic up for 14 minutes in the hour. The A30 at Sunningdale is a very useful escape route when the A3 blocks up, which is very frequent indeed. If the train frequency is enhanced, that crossing will be closed for 42 minutes in the hour. That is the sort of problem that you would get if you tried to enhance and improve the rail system on the southern approaches from Waterloo out to Bracknell, which is a very big growth area, and also to Reading. It is pie in the sky. Let us talk reasonably and properly, not try to hoodwink everybody. Thank you.

### **Janpal Basran**

Thank you, Chair, and thank you for your patience. I am not sure at this time of the afternoon I want to be lumped with the Monster Raving Loony Party but I am going to confess I also support Heathrow expansion. I will explain why. My name is Janpal Basran. I am a Southall resident and I also work for a local charity in Southall called Southall Community Alliance. We provide a voice for the local community and voluntary sector. I have been listening to the excellent arguments put forward by some of the gentlemen on the left front there about sub-regional opportunity for business development, but I would like to bring that down to a micro level, because I have heard also some really compelling reasons why we should look in the other direction which are based upon very low-level experiences.

I am the son and grandson, actually, of people who have worked at Heathrow over the last 35 years. It is something which has shaped both my experiences and the experiences of my family, and I have many others who are still working at Heathrow. I am one of many thousands of people from the

Southall area who have a similar experience – who have been brought up knowing that we have this magnet for attracting inward investment and inward employment to the sub-region that has been such a benefit to our area. My observations are really that sometimes we tend to take for granted the very things which make our community strong.

I was listening to some of the councillors earlier on. One or two of them I think alluded to the fact that Heathrow expansion may damage community cohesion. I am not really quite sure how they arrived at that conclusion, but I can tell you our experience. Southall has a population, according to the last census, of something like 70,000-odd people. It is a gross underestimate, but that is the official figure. It is hugely diverse and very vibrant. It does suffer from pockets of deprivation, but it is also a very transient population. It is changing all the time. We are possibly benefitting at the moment from a number of really key developmental opportunities. The first is the Southall Gas Works site development, which is the largest brownfield site development I believe in Europe. Number two, we have the possibility of greater links sub-regionally created by the arrival of Crossrail. Number three, I think the opportunities posed by the possible expansion of Heathrow are too huge to ignore. Community cohesion is completely undermined when you do not have economic prosperity, in my opinion. If people do not have jobs, you will find that you see a much greater [inaudible] –

[Applause and heckling]

We all did the courtesy of listening to other people. Please could you extend the same courtesy to us? I am not speaking on behalf of anybody; I am providing a local resident's perspective from Ealing. I was a bit disappointed by our local council leader's explanation for their position, and I would have hoped that they would have nailed their colours more firmly and unequivocally to the mast than they did. Nonetheless, in my experience, the vast majority of Southall residents, Southall businesses, Southall faith groups and Southall community-sector organisations are overwhelmingly in support of the expansion of Heathrow. Yes, there are negative impacts, but I think there are things which can be done sensibly through discussion and negotiation to mitigate those. That is a process, and I think this Commission's job is to start that process and keep it going. I seriously believe that it is actually a very good thing for the sub-region and I hope that this is something that is taken up. Thank you.

## **Closing Remarks**

### **Sir Howard Davies**

I am afraid that although I know that there are other people who want to get in or get in again I am going to call a halt now, with the exception of the fact that Phil Graham and some of my team will be staying to take points from other members of the public who wish to put in comments to us, and we would be very happy to take them.

I think it is pretty clear that this is an extraordinarily complex issue – I guess no one would disagree with that; that might be the only thing on which everybody would agree – ranging from some very big macroeconomic questions which some of the business community raised down to very micro issues of the way individual families will be affected. I think that the Commission – I know I speak

for all of my colleagues – very much value the perceptions of individuals. I think you have heard from the promoters that whatever the eventual outcome of the process opening this up has created a lot of new thinking about, even if the airport stays as it is, how it should deal with its local community. I think we would probably all agree that that was positive.

The dialogue continues until early February for responses. I would encourage you to submit responses to us if you have them. On behalf of the Commission members who are here, I would like to thank the business representatives who came along to speak to us, and I also thank the promoters, who have been there all day and done their best. I have a feeling that they have taken away an agenda of further questions which they are going to have to answer from individuals or from community groups. That is probably all to the good, whatever the outcome.

Thank you all for devoting a day to contributing to this process. I can assure you it is a very important part of our work, and I am sure we will be hearing from some of you further. Thank you.

**This Full Transcript was produced by Ubiquis UK ☎ +44 (0) 20 7269 0370**  
**<http://www.ubiquis.co.uk> / [infouk@ubiquis.com](mailto:infouk@ubiquis.com)**