Motion to RBWM Council 9 December 2014 re Airports Commission & Heathrow *+ Added Notes*

“This Council resolves to urgently inform the Airports Commission it Strongly Opposes Heathrow expansion, bring forward the Aviation Forum and ATRB newspaper to collate details and inform residents (and neighbouring Council representatives at AF) in time for wider objections to the catastrophic need of nearly 70,000 houses for 112,000 employees, stress on services, new flight paths and fewer quiet periods.” *NB The proposed actions were amended*

1. Having represented RBWM at around 160 Heathrow related meetings in the last 10 years [at HACC, its Noise & Track Keeping Group, and LAANC (which I have Chaired for the last 7years) as well as Airport Commission meetings], I fully appreciate Heathrow's huge contribution to the prosperity of the region, but also its pitfalls.

2. Despite the enormous publicity and the airport's distorted “Back Heathrow” campaign, its site investment is so huge that it definitely will NOT close if it does not get another runway, nor will its importance decline in a growing industry.

3. The recent Airports Commission meeting exposed that ABSOLUTELY NOBODY has considered where families from over 800 demolished houses will go, nor the 70,000 homes the Commission says 112,000 extra employees will need. (*70,000 jobs on or related to Heathrow but many in 'catalytic' business growth in wider area)*

4. This is A VERY SERIOUS PROBLEM for RBWM and nearby Councils as the Commission small print says that all the 14 Councils near Heathrow would need to build 500 new houses p.a .for 10 years – but as Slough and some London Boroughshave no spare land the pressure on us will be even greater.

5. We are already having difficulty to find space for 701 new dwellings p.a. so more than 1,201 new dwellings for next 10 years is not possible – unless Govt waives GB clauses of the NPPF to enable Heathrow to expand.

6. The huge labour force required for Heathrow's extensions would prevent the simultaneous building of more houses, schools, health centres and road improvements.

Rising land values would curtail much needed affordable housing.

7. We need to explain all this in an early ATRB *(Borough Council newspaper)* to get a huge community response before 4th February to get the Commission to address THE REAL ISSUES. A costly house to house leaflet drop is likely to be binned as junk mail.

We need to involve nearby Councils because several *(in fact more, especially those not seriously troubled by aircraft noise)* will be unaware the Commission expects them to build 5,000 houses and other disadvantages they would suffer. We need to work together to add strength to resist the challenge to the quality of life of our communities.

8. The emphasis of the proposals is to move activity & noise from London to RBWM Horton, Datchet & Eton and its college; also Colnbrook & Poyle.

Heathrow Hub's 3 kilometre extension of the northern runway toward Windsor would enormously damage the town, its tourist and hotel business.

More noise for more people over a wider spread of both departures and landings as satellite navigation grows is a very serious issue.

New aircraft cannot always get quieter.

We need to demand that the industry and Govt scrap 1982 standards and adopt current international noise mitigation *(e.g. WHO & EU standards) which, following the dismissal of the ANASE study, is a commitment by Govt relating to Terminal Five which has not been honoured*

9. Full Alternating use of the current two runways will give Noise Respite about 50% of the time near the airport, but a 3 runway airport would need one to operate in Mixed Mode with both landing & taking off to balance in & out movements, with no peace at either end.

Overall Respite will reduce to one third.

10. BAA (British Airports Authority) was ordered to sell Gatwick and Stansted to break its monopoly, but 3 runways at Heathrow would reverse that with 3 times as many runways as any other airport. Heathrow's improvement of compensation and mitigation offers were prompted by Gatwick's better package - a £1,000 Council tax contribution and double glazing up to 15 miles away; but Heathrow still only offers funding for 3 or 4 miles.

11. The Borough serves all sectors of the community, but businesses need to be reminded that a housing and commercial property shortage will escalate costs and force many of the lower paid (and public sector Key Workers) they rely upon to move out of the area. Those that commute will need incentives to do so and will exacerbate current traffic problems.

…...….................................. time limit cut off by Chairman ............................................................

12. Increasing the 12 lane M25 to 14 in a tunnel is a staggeringly short sighted proposal for a long term structure (in a Flood risk area) which would not even address today's daily gridlock.

The 50% increase in airport freight traffic would escalate road problems.

Heathrow's flood strategy includes holding lagoons on the River Colne – but Wraysbury's flooding near the M25 tunnel was caused by the Thames.

13. Heathrow still lists Southern Rail as a public transport service to relieve traffic congestion. But the conflict with level crossings make that a non runner (particularly at Sunningdale).

*NB Crossing gates there would close A30 for 42 minutes in the hour if train frequency increased*

14. Heathrow claims it will increase local youth employment opportunities with more apprenticeships, BUT RBWM is not included in their Five Priority Councils which benefit from this

*NB Slough is only Borough outside M25 included in Heathrow's apprenticeships and job schemes*

.

15.The demolition of Poyle Trading Estate would add pressure on development elsewhere.

*16. Heathrow say that R3 capacity will be taken up relatively soon (2040?) and a 4th runway would then be needed. A line in the sand needs to be drawn NOW. Enough is enough – competition is needed, not monopoly.*

**Cllr Malcolm Beer**