

PUBLIC MEETING AT ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH HALL, 7 pm on Tuesday 3 Sept 2019.

The meeting was chaired by Murray Fuller. About 40 (?) people attended. Councillor Tim Mitchell, WCC Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for the Environment, was there, as were Councillors Maggie Carman and Emily Payne of the Bayswater Ward and Margot Bright of the Lancaster Gate Ward.

Introduction by Paul Beckford, of the 'No 3rd Runway Coalition'

It's like a second airport. Adds a lot to traffic pollution. New technology enables LHR to have new concentrated flight paths which can reduce stacking but push approach paths further away from the airport. We know nothing yet on where the flight paths will be. 'Early Growth': - IPA could add 25,000 flights per year, 70 per day, the majority of which would take place in the 6am-7am period, if Heathrow succeed in getting the existing cap lifted. The M25 would be diverted and put in a tunnel under the new runway.

With a third runway, they say that we all would have a 6 1/2 hour beak from noise at night, but on some nights take-offs affecting us could be as late as midnight and on others landing planes would pass over built-up areas as early as 5 am.

The climate emergency has not been addressed, over a 30 year period the additional flights would put 183 tonnes of carbon into the air. New rail links, an important element of Heathrow's aspiration to achieve 55% arriving or leaving by public transport by 2040, would cost around £10bn (Heathrow have agreed to contribute only £1bn), and if not approved in the next year, will not be delivered before the opening of a 3rd runway.

The estimate of new permanent jobs have been consistently revised down since the Airports Commission report in 2014. It is apparent that they would mainly be low wage jobs in retail outlets in the Terminals. The DfT's own figures also show that many of the jobs created by expansion in 2030 will disappear by 2040. A 1% increase in costs would eliminate any economic benefits claimed to be delivered by the scheme. Further, the benefits were calculated on the basis that a third runway would be fully operational by 2026 yet Heathrow's masterplan proposes a phased opening of capacity thus reducing any economic benefit further.

There is plenty of spare airport capacity around the country that could be better utilised, particularly if proper investment is made in sustainable public transport access to regional airports.

Q & A

This was moderated by John Zamit, who did not otherwise speak. In order of the questions. I couldn't see the questioners. Answers were mainly from Paul Beckford, sometimes from Murray.

Q1. Was there any other instance of a major hub airport being situated so that the flight paths were over the city?

A. No, except Hong Kong, and they have since rebuilt the airport on a man-made island.

Q2. What petitions, how to respond to the consultation?

A. One P to Parliament. Another one is organised by No 3rd Runway on change.org. Our own website has guidance on how to respond to five issues, chosen from a long list.

Q3. How best to lobby, will there be planning application?

- A. You can lobby MPs, the Mayor and GLA, Councils, Government or quasi Government organs directly. (Eg. CAA, ICCAN.).
- B. The Planning inquiry will be in 2020-21, under the new DCO procedure, once Heathrow submit their application. There will be a one month window to register as an interested party, open to both individuals and organisations. There is more information on the Coalition website.
- C. The airspace change approval process is governed by the CAA. Heathrow want to introduce from 2022 'Independent Parallel Approaches' , IPA. That means early morning flights on both the existing two runways at the same time. (

Q4. Action by Councils?

- A. The Coalition includes of six London Boroughs, four of whom are taking legal action, the appeal is to be heard on 17 October. In addition, Newham and Islington are getting restive. Any Council can submit a local impact report to the DCO process, seeking mitigation.

Q5. What is Paul's sense of the Mayor's attitude, given the contradiction with his objective of limiting air pollution?

- A. The Mayor is against, many MPs are against as is the Prime Minister. Considering current policies on limiting air pollution, eg ULEZ, they probably don't go far enough. Even electric cars would generate some air pollution, through brake pad or tire dust, etc. London remains in breach of EU standards on air pollution.(Murray - should we lobby for better regulation on air pollution? Yes, the Government's strategy is inadequate and it has been defeated in the Courts.)
- B. A. TfL are opposed, in particular because there is no funding or finality of plans to achieve the hoped-for 50%+ of passengers arriving/leaving by public transport, in particular by rail. Possibly a £10 billion funding gap.

Q6. Will the new Government, and the prospect of delay in Brexit, alter the situation?

A. The new S of S on Transport says he is concerned about rising costs - Heathrow are trying to double the amount of their borrowing in advance of construction beginning.

Q7. Please act as 'Devil's Advocate' and say what are the arguments for expansion?

- A. - 1. The airport is full (but do we need so much interlining?. (75% of passengers using a 3rd runway would be international to international transfer passengers who add nothing to the UK economy - in fact the DfT guidance suggests that any benefits they bring should not be included in the economic analysis
- 2. Good for UK plc (but majority of their profits go overseas)
- 3. Heathrow loses in competition with other airports, fails to bring business to London.

4. Essential for goods delivery, as major hub airport (but transfer of goods there does not do much for London's economy, and sucks growth from regional airports).
5. London needs more regional routes (but for many of them improved high speed rail is better; and interlining regional to international at Heathrow inhibits the development of international services at Regional airports).

Q8. Security and terrorism.

Huge expansion does bring with it an associated safety risk.

It is for others to comment on security aspects of expansion.

Q9. Why not Gatwick?

A. The Government decision in favour of Heathrow followed the conclusions of the Airports Commission, charged with determining the best location for a new runway in the South East. It considered a second runway at Gatwick together with two options for a third runway at Heathrow. Gatwick could be delivered more quickly, at lower costs and with a lesser impact in terms of noise and air pollution, but Heathrow was considered better for passengers and cargo, and hence for London's economy. *However, Gatwick still plan to go ahead with a planning application for its own second runway, the moratorium on such an application being about to expire.*

Q10. Cargo?

A. There are no cargo only flights into Heathrow, that is done at the East Midlands airport. But passenger planes have large cargo holds and Heathrow aspire to double cargo, by weight from 1.7 to 3.4 million tonnes, even with a 60% increase in the number of flights. Will add to the strain on the M25 etc.

One participant asked why are you objecting, given the economic benefits? He added that he thinks that noise is something we all have to live with, since we all knew when moving in that a major airport is close.

Conclusion

Final remarks, also see previous note. Councillor Tim Mitchell said that WCC would respond to the current consultation. Councillor Carman said Karen Buck MP had voted against the expansion.

Murray concluded by saying, go to the websites, both ours and that of the 'No 3rd Runway Coalition', respond to the consultation and sign the two online Petitions.