

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I am writing to make a representation to the Davis Commission against both of the two proposals for the expansion of Heathrow. As a resident of Old Windsor my main objections to the two Heathrow proposals are on:-

- The effect of runway expansion on the environment and infrastructure.
- The increase in the number of flights allowed and the erosion of the night time periods of respite.
- The commercial bias of the evidence put forward by Heathrow plc.

I enclose a copy of an e-mail to Adam Afriyie explaining these points more fully and his reply to me.

I agree with and support the statement submitted by the Old Windsor Parish Council (attached). I also agree with the points of view put forward by the Englefield Green Action Group and the Teddington Action Group against Expansion of Heathrow.

regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

OLD WINDSOR PARISH COUNCIL'S INDICATIVE RESPONSES

TO AVIATION COMMISSION QUESTIONS ("Bundle 1")

QUESTION 1 : Conclusions on the Three Options, etc.

(3). **The Heathrow NW Runway** would only be 1,045m north of the existing northern runway, between the A4 Bath Road and the M4. It is based on the previous Runway 3 proposal, but being closer to the existing runway it would avoid the demolition of several listed buildings and relocating the M4/M25 interchange. Most of the villages there would disappear under the runway which would end over a half mile closer to Colnbrook as it would be set far further west than the present runways.

(4). The relocation of the Grndon Power From Waste Recovery site from alongside the Colnbrook By Pass will be a major exercise – if another site can be found.

(5). **The Heathrow Extended Northern Runway** would double the length of the present northern runway to the west and end between Horton and Colnbrook, nearly one and a half miles closer to Windsor. This would have a hugely detrimental noise impact on the town and its international tourist attractions.

A central separation zone between the new and existing runways would allow take off flights from the end facing into the wind and landings at the other end.

(6). Alternative premises for businesses displaced by the demolition of the Poyle Trading Estate would be difficult to locate anywhere else in the area.

(7). **Both of the Heathrow runways** would cross the M25, which would have to be tunnelled under them, which could create problems relating to flooding policies and widening the M25 in future years.

(10). **The Gatwick Runway** would be on the Crawley side of the airport. It differs from Heathrow in that there are very few houses near either end of the runway

and the airport proposes to continue to promote direct flights to a large number of places rather than a hub operation. There is space for associated growth.

(11.) Almost all of the Councils around Heathrow are now backing Gatwick because West Sussex CC and I think Crawley BC were among others supporting it to provide employment and boost the local economy.

(13). Heathrow paid its mouthpiece **“Back Heathrow”**, which ran a sustained and costly false scare campaign about loss of jobs under the guise of being an independent residents group, to claim more support than opposition. It should be noted that few if any Councils or other bodies have had either the funding or staff availability to challenge this less than realistic alarmist publicity, so most of the people polled for an opinion have unfortunately not had a full grasp of the facts. Despite that a poll carried out on behalf of the RBWM has shown an appreciable majority opposed to another runway at Heathrow and support for one at Gatwick.

OLD WINDSOR PARISH COUNCIL'S INDICATIVE RESPONSES

TO AVIATION COMMISSIONS QUESTIONS (“Bundle 2”)

QUESTION 1: Conclusions on the Three Options, etc

(10). **Both Heathrow proposers claim aircraft noise will reduce. Will it?**

They are being very economical with the truth, as they ignore that

a) it would be far quieter if there is no additional runway

b) flights to or from either runway located further west than the existing ones will create far more noise over our far quieter areas than London

ci) probably residents largest current concern about aircraft noise is the number of noise incidents created by aircraft near them together with the related interruptions to everyday life, yet the proposers brush aside the fact that the noise climate will be hugely escalated by the 54% increase in the number of flights and associated noise events, and

d) either new runway will inevitably generate noise under new flight paths affecting communities not previously affected.

(11+22). The overall aircraft fleet will be marginally quieter than that of today, but costly technology cannot continue to make the sweeping advances which the proposers rely on in their noise and pollution predictions, and as existing aircraft have to fly for 25 years to repay their huge initial costs many noisy planes will fly for years to come. The super quiet A380 is surprisingly no quieter than the noisy B747 in one flight mode.

Both Rolls Royce and Boeing / Pratt & Whitney experts have told different meetings of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee that engine designers could concentrate on reducing noise or pollution but could not achieve both.

A three runway airport will reduce respite (quiet) periods from half the time (after the take off ban over Cranford ceases) to less than a third, as well as hitting people between two runways with noise from two sides – but this is almost hidden by the new runway proposers. Community representatives have fought long and hard to retain 'alternation' which on a two runway Heathrow allows aircraft to land on one and take off on the other, and share the noise by changing over at 3 pm every day. That is not possible with either of the three runway options.

HAL craftily says that it will continue the *principle* of alternation with its separate runways but about a third of the time one has to accommodate both landings and take offs at the same time, so neither end will get any respite. The Heathrow Hub Extended Runway, with two in-line runways, has far fewer options and an even greater loss of respite.

QUESTION 2: HOW COULD OPTIONS BE IMPROVED, ETC

25). It is inconceivable that UK residents could continue to suffer almost 50 year old noise standards – among the worst in the western world – when a new runway opens in 2030.

(23). The proposals relate to operations which could start to operate 15 years into the future, so it is totally inappropriate for the Commission not to strongly

recommend that an entirely different modern approach to controlling aircraft noise is introduced. The Commission will be well aware that around 15 years ago the Government adopted the exhaustive Terminal 5 Inquiry recommendation that an entirely different method of calculating and controlling aircraft noise should be urgently adopted.

(24). That resulted in the 6 year £1.4million ANASE study, but the findings were disputed and rejected by Government, which has done nothing since to honour its commitment to replace the discredited and outdated 33 year old ANIS standards. They remain the controlling measures on UK aircraft noise, and have been the subject of a long history of an enormous number of objections.

The logarithmic averaging of noise pays little regard to peak noise or frequency and the N70 count of noise incidents over 70dB takes no account of the many incidents up to 90dB which are inflicted on this area, nor the vast majority of flights which exceed the widely accepted 55dB threshold of annoyance level.

This community strongly urges the Commission to impress upon the UK Government that there is an urgent need for it to honour its commitment to investigate and set up aircraft noise controls appropriate to present day aviation operations and public expectations regarding their health and quality of life.

It is recommended that an Independent Runway 'Slot' Allocation System is established with a view to reducing restrictive practices and increasing seat capacity use to free up airport capacity:

It is very obvious that Heathrow has got a huge wasted capacity due to the average used seating capacity of all aircraft using the airport being as low as just over 70%. If something were done to maximise seat take up, and reduce the 27 daily flights to both Paris and New York, the airport would have a very substantial spare capacity to open up other routes and give more flexibility.

If it was possible to increase the overall seat take up to an average of 90% there

would be nearly 20% extra available capacity, and the annual flight number cap of 480,000 x 20% would allow 96,000 more flights p.a.

But this will not happen because the exercise of 'grandfather rights' on take off and landing slots give the 'owning' airlines the right to fly from or to them to wherever they wish with however many passengers as they wish, and to deny competitors access to those slots they accept having to fly aircraft with lower passenger numbers.

Notwithstanding that these slots have a high financial (and commercial) value, it is strongly suggested that the Commission should recommend that legislation is introduced to outlaw this practice to:

- a) prevent restrictive practices and promote competition on a level playing field,
- b) maximise use of strategically important assets,
- c) reduce the demands for take up of more land for airport expansion,
- d) reduce the number of flights to the benefit of all parties, including operators having to fly, service and fuel fewer aircraft – although there would be a downside for those which would have to surrender their grandfather slots to in return for a realistic surrender value,
- e) maximise use of airport facilities,
- f) free up slots for flights to/from alternative destinations and new operators,
- g) all of which would be in the public interest.

It is high time to bite the bullet to cease this very harmful restrictive practice which does not appear to happen elsewhere in Europe.

It is strongly recommended that the Commission makes a firm recommendation to Government that 'grandfather rights on slots' is discontinued and current airline owned company which allocates any free slots is replaced by an entirely independent government agency to allocate slots impartially and transfer use fees to to the relevant airport after retaining a small percentage to cover its costs.

(6). **Apprenticeships:** HAL's claims about promoting apprenticeships and careers for

10,000 young people are questioned as it is not supported by its established policies, as it only works in these matters with what it calls its Five Stakeholder Councils, and has persistently excluded Councils such as RBWM from its jobs and careers fairs.

QUESTION 3: HOW HAS COMMISSION CARRIED OUT APPRAISAL, ETC

Without exception the people with whom the author of this has discussed the Aviation Commission's work have all been very impressed by the range and thoroughness of the investigation and analysis of those of the huge range of documents which they have read.

There is however some unease about the final result after the data has been balanced to reach the overall conclusions. It would seem that the strong business orientated background of the Commissioners who may not have a close affinity with the area shows through in regard to an apparently weaker radar about everyday living activities and needs of the public at large around the airports.

Perhaps it is unfair to highlight the almost dismissive summation of the Commission's assessment of the huge potential need for 70,800 additional houses within the area near Heathrow as "a significant challenge to the 14 nearby Councils", but this appears to show a disappointing lack of appreciation of the highly developed area and how the mechanics of local government, housing provision and planning function.

It is to be hoped that if the practice of trying to balance resulting detrimental problems against less than proven employment and business opportunities to assess the pros and cons of a group of opposing topics is to continue, which is often akin to choosing whether chalk or cheese is the better, then it is requested that greater regard to the effects upon the wider community should be given in the concluding stages of the Commission's work.

QUESTION 4: FACTORS NOT FULLY ADDRESSED, ETC

(1). **Where will the huge workforce live?**

Probably the greatest and permanent impact of 112,400 extra employees related to Heathrow Airport's proposed new North West Runway would be the need for over 70,000 new houses. Both proposals would be far more serious than the Commission's astoundingly unrealistic assessment of “a significant challenge to the 14 local Councils” as they are already on the verge of a housing crisis. The proposers have been chided by the Commission for not identifying where space for such housing could be located, but it should have rejected the proposals as unsustainable in the absence of such essential data.

(2). Heathrow Hub's proposed doubling of the length of the existing Northern Runway may not create quite so many jobs or need quite so many houses, but its impact on housing and the infrastructure would only be marginally less than the above.

(3). Windsor & Maidenhead's present struggle to find space for 12,500 new houses in the next 15 years already seriously threatens the Green Belt (83% of the area of the Borough) as that equates to 701 houses a year on top of existing approvals, but an extra 500 p.a. over 10 years will be near to impossible to provide here or elsewhere unless standards are dropped. Tower blocks are a social disaster. Large flood risk areas and inadequate drainage and sewage capacity exacerbate the local problems. It took years after the last housing 'boom' for the water, gas and electricity supply companies to dig up our roads and upgrade their service mains to match the increased demands.

(4). **More roads, schools, doctors and hospitals:** The Commission anticipates the need but does not seem to appreciate the extent of the stress already upon these things. If there is not enough land for housing and other needs all costs will escalate as in previous periods of economic overheating, and lower paid key workers will leave the area, which despite the business community's enthusiasm will considerably challenge their viability.

(5). **Could the building industry cope** with another runway, terminal and associated works being built at the same time as all the necessary housing and

infrastructure? It would be an enormous problem for the industry which the runway proposers and supporters have failed to consider. The proposals are simply unsustainable.

(7). **The roads around Heathrow are already too busy** so it is already actively considering congestion charging around the airport, surely indisputable proof that there would be awful road problems if it gets a 54% increase in flights.

(8). A minimal two lane increase on the already daily gridlocked M25 where it would be confined by a tunnel is an astoundingly short sighted and unacceptable proposal as it could not be widened to cope with the huge increases in activity which both runway proposers anticipate. The so called Smart Motorway works on the M4 where the hard shoulder safety lanes are being sacrificed for permanent traffic lanes is the clearest possible demonstration that the road system is already overloaded.

(19). Other surface access proposals by HAL are likely to have far reaching repercussions as the tunnelling of the A4 Bath Road between the two northern runways would disrupt the local distributor function of this important trunk road and compromise widening to meet increasing future demands.

(20+21). **The doubling of cargo capacity and movement of it entirely by road** from a depot remote from the motorways would put a huge additional juggernaut burden on the road network which HAL have avoided to mention. The Heathrow Hub proposals have not been assessed, but will add to local problems however its surcharge is handled.

(16). **Public Transport:** Heathrow claims it will get 50% of its passengers using public transport, but there is no evidence of how that can be achieved as it remains an unfulfilled target at the present time. HAL has been actively considering Congestion Charging to address current problems, but has gone silent on that during the consultation period as it is aware that that would be an unpopular means of promoting its use of public transport use target.

(17). **The reliance on a modified revival of the former Airtrack rail scheme to Staines Southern Rail station to increase use of public transport is a totally unrealistic proposal. The Southern Rail network from London Waterloo to Staines, Reading, Guildford and beyond was built when there was very little road traffic and has many level crossings which would unacceptably increase road congestion if train frequencies were increased. The study of the viability of Airtrack demonstrated that the A30 crossing at Sunningdale would have almost doubled the closure of that important trunk road and 'safety valve' for the M3 to 42 minutes in the hour!**

(18). **Heathrow's references to the Crossrail and the Western Rail Access schemes being appropriate to the expansion of Heathrow dodge the fact that these are necessary and designed to meet today's London and Heathrow traffic needs, and are not a financial gamble anticipating that Heathrow will continue to ex**

(8). **Flood risks: M25 and A4 tunnels would displace a huge volume of underground water storage capacity and, contrary to EA policy, create greater flood risks elsewhere. The only flood mitigation proposed appears to be in upstream lagoons on the Colne, which would do nothing to relieve the increased threat upon the present serious flood risk area around Wraysbury and the Thames.**

(9). **Revised flight paths: The recent trails caused a great deal of additional noise and distress on both sides of the airport. It is indisputable that the skies over SE England are full of aircraft and flight paths will have to be changed to reduce fuel use, pollution and time wasting aircraft 'stacking' (circling) in locations around Heathrow until a landing slot is available. Another runway close to two of the world's busiest will make the skies even more crowded and new routes will have to avoid conflicts between 54% more flights to and from more Heathrow runways. No decisions have been made about where the additional flights and their noise will be routed as UK, EU and Trans Atlantic computerised flight path control is under total review – but indications should have been given.**

QUESTION 5: THE 16 APPRAISAL MODULES.

The absence of a mention of the serious Health Issues within the Appraisal Modules of the Commission's Objectives is a grave omission in the balancing of the

pros and cons of the runway proposals which would have been expected under 'People' and 'Quality of Life' appraisals.

A series of comments on airport related health problems is being drafted.

QUESTION 6: SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENTS, ETC

Neither of the proposals for an additional runway at Heathrow meet the recognised criteria for being sustainable as the long term affects will seriously impair the quality of life of future generations.

It may not be appreciated that road congestion, housing, and the entire built and services infrastructures including schools, medical, leisure and sports facilities are already stretched to breaking point and a 54% increase in flights by bigger aircraft carrying an even larger number of passengers would be enormously challenging for an already short and expensive land supply and funding from the public purse.

Existing unacceptable noise and air pollution problems would be exacerbated over a far wider area and an even larger population, all of which would unreasonably add to tensions and health problems exacerbated by the current circumstances.

These items are outlined under the other Questions and their collective impact would be truly staggering. The interests of a thriving business community and the prospect of additional employment in an area where unemployment is only a factor in two sub areas do nothing to justify the many harmful effects and an overheated economy on the character of the sub region or the wellbeing of its communities.

Both of the Heathrow runway proposals are very obviously NOT sustainable.

QUESTION 7: BUSINESS CASES, ETC

(12). An even larger monopoly is not in the public interest:

Another runway at Heathrow would multiply its capacity from over twice to over three times that of any other UK airport. A few years ago the Competition Commission forced BAA to sell Gatwick and Stansted to create a more level playing field and fair competition in civil aviation. It would be a flagrant abuse of Government policy to make Heathrow larger than the aggregate of all its competitors in the South East.

(13). To rub salt into the wound, should Heathrow be allowed to have another runway there would be something like a goldrush to reserve a large number of take off and landing 'slots' after decades of demand outstripping their availability and value. This could have a disastrous impact upon Gatwick if many flight operators were to transfer to a brand new Heathrow facility.

(14). Yet another runway is likely to be needed after 2040 is a fearsome prospect that the Commission accepts. Heathrow has already admitted that it would be bidding for a fourth runway in the future to meet further demands. It's would case be sharpened by the fact that a three runway airport creates difficulties balancing arrival and departure movements (and providing alternation and respite periods) Further Heathrow expansion should cease NOW - Enough is enough.

It should endeavour to be Better, NOT Bigger.

(15). An example of why Heathrow should have competitors is that it only upgraded its compensation and mitigation offers in the latter stages of the Commission's consultation after Gatwick offered its own worst affected neighbours an annual £1,000 Council tax subsidy and double glazing up to 15 miles along its flight paths. But Heathrow still only offers the latter up to about 4 or 5 miles away and its publicity about its £550 million compensation offer does not mention that £300 million of this is allocated for its essential Compulsory Purchases.

QUESTION 8: OTHER COMMENTS

No Comments

Subject:

Heathrow Noise and Expansion

From:

[REDACTED]

Date:

04/01/2015 19:12

To:

adam.afriyie.mp@parliament.uk

Dear Mr Afriyie

I am pleased to see the information on your website regarding your position on Heathrow expansion. I, as a long time resident of Old Windsor, am well used to the pros and cons of being neighbours of Heathrow but there are limits to what is acceptable. I rarely become exercised about issues but I do feel strongly on this one, so I would be pleased to support any activities you can undertake to avoid unreasonable Heathrow expansion.

The picture can be oversimplified however and it is not just about the 3rd runway. The aspects that concern me most are:

3rd runway. Either Heathrow option would not be a sufficient 'solution' and would have a large local impact due to aircraft noise and traffic. Your web-site summarises it nicely

Night flights. Even if the 3rd runway is not built at Heathrow, there is the potential for Heathrow Ltd to lobby the CAA and others to allow more flights overall and more night flights in particular, encroaching further into the (so called) curfew. The recent trials and the impact of surfacing the North runway highlighted how close we are to the cusp of what is acceptable. (flights landing from 4.45 am with 12-15 before 6am (ref: flight tracking web-site) does have an unreasonable impact). The curfew needs to be maintained and, if possible, rolled back.

Lobbying and the effect of 'optimism bias' and complexity in the modelling. I have seen the voluminous consultation documents from the Airports Commission. I have also witnessed Heathrow Ltd's public consultation which, I am sorry to say, was biased and 'economical with the truth'; in short it was a sales pitch. This may not be very surprising but when coupled with, for example, optimistic assumptions about the effect of improved aircraft performance on noise, let alone more complex economic arguments, there is the potential for the Airports Commission to come to a flawed recommendation. Even the simplified and selective information presented to 'win over' the local population was baffling, and obscured the overall effect that their proposal would have, thus deflecting criticism. The Airports Commission and the decision makers need to reach a robust solution to a complex problem, not one based on a series of series of finely balanced assumptions which may well end up not being valid.

I hope that this letter helps to support you in arguing against Heathrow expansion. If there is anything further that I as an individual can do to help, please let me know. I plan to write also to the Council and to the Airports Commission in a similar vein to this e-mail. I don't plan to submit noise complaints or write to the CAA or Heathrow Airports Ltd as I need to prioritise my time and I am cynical about the effect such complaints will have. Even when the effect of noise is having a significant impact, it is not clear what criteria would be used for a complaint to be successful and hence many will be off target and easily dismissed by those with a vested interest to do so.

regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Wednesday, 5th March 2014

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email regarding Heathrow expansion.

Like you, I am naturally concerned at the prospect of expansion. I am a resident of Old Windsor, and have been actively campaigning on this matter for many years, having attended marches, written to Government ministers and being a member of Project Heathrow Watch, HACAN and WAAAG. You can find an example of some of the meetings, marches, events I've been involved in over the past 10 years on my website www.adamafriyie.org – sadly there is not enough room to include them all and website provides just a selection of the kind of things I do as your MP.

There is no doubt that aviation has a huge role to play in delivering long-term economic growth. It makes a significant contribution to the UK economy and importantly provides the international connectivity this country needs to thrive in the highly competitive global economy. Aviation should be able to grow, but it must also play its part in delivering our environmental goals and protecting the quality of life of local communities.

The recent recommendations of the Davies Commission on airport expansion in the UK sadly recommended the expansion of Heathrow. I however, am very clear. There should not be a third runway, nor any increase in the number of flights from the current 480,000 limit. A third runway would mean an extra 260 million passengers in and out of Heathrow a year. It would bulldoze nearly 1,000 local homes, pave over our important flood protections and destroy local areas of natural beauty.

I am continually reassured by the number of active residents, the many campaign groups and the Conservative party's commitment to this cause. I have frequently been in contact with the Chief Executive at Heathrow, and I will continue to speak up on behalf of all those affected by our noisy neighbour. You have my commitment that I will continue to echo local concerns in Parliament as I fight tooth and nail to get the best possible long-term outcome for Windsor residents.

You may also wish to sign this petition against further expansion at Heathrow: <http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/no-third-runway#>. Once completed, it will be taken to Number 10 Downing Street for the Prime Minister's attention.

Thank you once again for taking the time to write to me on this important issue.

Yours sincerely,

Adam Afriyie MP