

[REDACTED]

Email Subject: Response to AC consultation on runway capacity in the SE

Email Body:

Dear sir or madam

Please note that I strongly object to any expansion of London Heathrow Airport.

First and foremost, I expect the Commission to remain sceptical about all information and data put forward by the privately-owned corporation that is Heathrow. It is driven by profit for its owners, with only superficial regard for the surrounding communities.

Also, I would like the Commission to acknowledge that having the deadline for comments for this report in winter means that objections are not as high as could be expected in summer, as local residents have not fully experienced the impact of the latest flight path changes on their outdoor (and open window) lives.

As a local resident, I have been appalled at the propaganda, biased questionnaires and downright lies that that Heathrow PR campaign has been circulating. The two most glaring examples of this that I am aware of are:

- 1) The questionnaires implied that there was a straight-forward choice between Heathrow expansion and Heathrow closure, so using fear to get the answers it wanted. As such, the results

of this questionnaire should be omitted from any assessment of local feeling about Heathrow expansion.

2) Heathrow is repeatedly telling us that the flight paths have not changed. We moved to our house 20 months ago from a flight path (previously we have lived in Egham and most recently, Wraysbury – right on the low-flying flight path!). The most notable thing for us when we moved here was that there were hardly any planes at all, to the extent that if we heard one, my sons rushed outside to look at it. We are now subjected to almost daily, extended periods of time from early morning to very late night when we can have loud planes going overhead every couple of minutes. This is really impacting our lives and a great source of stress for us. Heathrow is lying about something. Either these flight paths weren't previously used, or these are new flight paths.

I would assume that the Commission is very aware of this, but as I've been caught out by assumptions in the past, I would rather state these two points than not.

My responses to the Commission's specific questions are below.

Q1. What conclusions, if any, do you draw in respect of the three short-listed options? In answering this question please take into account the Commission's consultation documents and any other information you consider relevant.

- Heathrow noise is already a major blight on the lives of many local residents and this burden must not be increased. Heathrow's neighbours for miles around already bear a huge burden on behalf of the rest of the UK and Europe, which is already intolerable in many areas.
- The noise impact needs to be reduced, not increased, and certainly no more areas should be affected as many local people have moved within the area (at great personal cost) to escape the old flight paths. It is estimated that 28% of all people impacted by aircraft noise across Europe live under the Heathrow flight path – more than Frankfurt, Paris CDG, Paris Orly, Manchester,

Brussels and Amsterdam combined. The UK Government has a duty of care not to increase this figure and to choose quality of life, health and well-being for UK citizens, over corporate greed.

- Both HRW options will mean additional noise for local communities that will affect at least 1 million people. I would argue that this would actually be a lot more as my household is probably not included in that figure, but with the recent flight path changes, our community is definitely experiencing the negative impacts of Heathrow more than ever before.
- Residents under all flight paths will be subjected to constant, loud aircraft noise disturbance, 365 days per year, from 4.30am to 11.30pm – or 24/7 if the Heathrow Board get their way. I do not know how many people are objecting in person at this stage, but at the Ascot meeting about the Heathrow flight trials last year, there were literally thousands of people there to object. This is NOT a noise nor air pollutant that we want to 'get used to' to the point that 'we won't even notice it' and nor should we be expected to.
- Just because aircraft noise is projected to decrease in the future, does mean that the irritant will be removed. The frequency as well as the decibel level are both significant factors in assessing noise pollution.
- The infrastructure around Heathrow is already at breaking point. Schools are over-subscribed, housing in
- I am also concerned about the safety issues. No-one can guarantee that there will never be an air traffic accident, so why is there a proposal to continue to concentrate that risk over one of the most densely populated cities in the world?

Q2. Do you have any suggestions for how the short-listed options could be improved, i.e. their benefits enhanced or negative impacts mitigated? The options and their impacts are summarised in section three.

- Negative impacts could be mitigated by eliminating both Heathrow options due to increased noise impact (in terms of frequency, distribution and decibels), air pollution, conflict with Northolt.
- Negative impacts could also be mitigated by going back to the question of whether additional runway capacity in the UK is required at all:
  - o We have many airports that are not operating at capacity. Where is the plan to develop and utilise those? And also to fill all flights that are currently coming in and out of the UK.
  - o Is it the privately-owned, commercially-driven airport owners leading the argument for more

runway capacity?

- o It is in the interests of the UK population as a whole to be looking at alternatives to all types of travel, especially air travel.

The UK has an obligation to explore these fully first, before settling on a 'Heathrow or Gatwick' assessment. And even if it is an 'impossible' step to take at this stage, it STILL needs to be fully assessed before moving on.

Q3. Do you have any comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal? The appraisal process is summarised in section two.

- The noise metrics currently referred to by the Commission are not sufficient and any decision from this process must be delayed pending diligent, comprehensive noise tests to be run throughout the affected areas.
- We live in postcode SL5 0LY. Heathrow tells me that I have forgotten that there was aircraft noise before the flight trials last August. Furthermore, it tells me that it was the same as we are experiencing now - loud airplane noise every couple of minutes at peak times, with a few incredibly loud planes of note most evenings. Heathrow tells me I just didn't notice them before. But I clearly remember getting my kids to run outside to see the planes whenever we heard them because they were so rare. And I also remember afternoons in the garden feeling so very pleased that we had moved away from the under the flight path in Wraysbury because now we could enjoy our outdoor space and even wake up to peace and quiet, only interrupted by bird song. Now I am waking up to aircraft noise nearly every morning. One of us is lying/mistaken. I know it is Heathrow, so what other lies are they telling me? Or the Commission?
- The presentation of findings is inaccessible for many. Corporations, like Heathrow, have teams of professionals paid to work through this kind of paperwork. By comparison many of us who oppose Heathrow expansion as individuals and citizens, are resource poor, lacking professional expertise or technical know-how in this area and reliant on the accessible information that is circulated to us. As the main source of much of that information, Heathrow has been biased, deceitful and lacking ethics, so many local residents are coming from a lack of real information or understanding. This is not uncommon (as seen with the Frankfurt demonstrations after the airport expansion), but it means that we are reliant on the Commission to make a decision while acting for us, the People, so that our rights are protected and our lives are not blighted with retrospective protests for years to come.

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

- We live in a democratic country where, thankfully, our citizens have rights to live their lives under certain assumptions. These assumptions MUST be protected. Noise measurement used in such an important decision as this, with far-reaching consequences, needs to incorporate peak noise levels (both in terms of frequency and decibel rating by each area), distribution of noise (numbers affected) and the effect of frequency of flights (leading to a compounded noise).
- Excessive noise across the area will negatively impact residents, businesses, schools, tourist attractions, amongst many others, and is also linked to a variety of serious negative health implications.
- Air quality in the area around Heathrow already exceeds WHO safety limits (this is further compounded by the proximity of the M25) and we know that air pollution damages health. This impact needs to be taken seriously by the Commission.
- Modelling is not enough. The Commission has a duty of care to ensure that the quality of life of local residents is preserved (at a minimum) and enhanced where possible. Accurate metrics for noise pollution and air quality (including PM10s and PM5s) need to be ascertained before a decision can be reached.
- FLOODING. The Commission needs to consider where the building materials will come from and what effect on the flood plain additional largely tarmacked areas will have on the flood plain. Gravel that occurs naturally in the nearby area is essential to maintaining the drainage in the flood plain. If this is removed AND further areas tarmacked over that are currently acting as drainage areas, then this area, which experienced serious flooding in January 2014, will be even more vulnerable. Other than the worry and house selling issues this would mean to local residents, what would it mean for house insurance? The Commission has a duty to investigate this fully and INDEPENDENTLY of Heathrow or Heathrow funded assessments.
- Heathrow's constant propaganda. This decision needs to be made in the public interest. It should not be affected by the biased 'research' paid for by Heathrow.
- Not sure if this is in the Commission's remit: is it a given that we HAVE to have more runway space in the South East? Shouldn't we be trying to decrease air travel in line with environmental targets?
- Considering how many people could be negatively impacted by this decision, the Commission has a duty of care to fully investigate and list out
  - o ALL health conditions linked to aircraft noise pollution, air pollution and other conditions linked

specifically to airports.

- o All impacts of the construction phase on health, well-being and communities, along with the practical daily social, economic, transport, waste management and health impacts that the construction would have in such a densely populated area next to the M25. This needs to take into account the duration of the phases as there is an endurance factor in play too.
  - o All impacts of where the materials are sourced from for the construction phase, including social, economic, transport, waste management, health and environmental, along with restoration plans (there are problems and delays with sourcing a lot of gravel in the area due to these exact factors).
  - o All impacts of what the development will mean environmentally and socially.
  - o All impacts of the destruction of homes and displacement of thousands of people required for the development, including rehousing them along with the additional workers an expanded Heathrow projects that it will need.
- Transfer traffic is estimated at 37% of the passengers who use Heathrow, so they have no preference for Heathrow as an airport and bring little economic benefit to the local area, only to the fat cats who own Heathrow. This needs to be investigated and all options explored fully.
  - Risk assessment on having just one UK hub airport.
  - Risk assessment on having Heathrow as a single UK hub airport.

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

- Health issues have not been thoroughly investigated or reported on.
- Environmental impact has not been thoroughly investigated, especially with regards impact on the flood plain.

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

- Housing and infrastructure – Heathrow's needs cannot be met locally without using Green

Belt and transforming the wider landscape for local communities, as well as what's going on in the air. This is NOT a welcome development for communities that are already struggling with the housing requirements and new build targets in densely populated areas.

- As mentioned in a previous point, all impacts of where the materials are sourced from for the construction phase, including social, economic, transport, waste management, health and environmental, along with restoration plans need to be assessed (there are problems and delays with sourcing a lot of gravel in the area due to these exact factors).

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

- Points 1-2. I do not accept the case for economic benefit vs adverse impact. This is not a true statement for local residents. It is also a questionable statement in relation to the rest of the UK!
- Points 2-7. For resilience, encourage competition and a networked hub, not one, over-crowded site.
- Points 8-9. Grandfather rights should be abolished.
- Point 10. Allocation of free slots must be done by an independent body, not one linked to an airline in any capacity!

Q8. Do you have any other comments?

- 'No ifs, no buts, there'll be no third runway at Heathrow'.
- No to a single hub, especially one so close to the capital and already polluted, overcrowded, over-burdened neighbourhoods!
- Properly evaluate whether additional runway capacity IN THE UK (not just the South East) is actually required, independent of Heathrow.
- Properly evaluate how to develop a longer term future where air travel decreases, in the interests of the environment and local communities.

-

[REDACTED]

I trust that the Commission will act democratically, in the best interests of UK citizens and residents.

Unlike some, I am incredibly proud of the democratic rights that we have and believe that we are entitled to have our human rights honoured and upheld in our daily lives by UK public bodies and their nominated agencies.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]